DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 664 UD 023 446

AUTHOR	Latkiewicz, John
TITLE	Industry's Reactions to the Indochinese.
INSTITUTION	Utah Technical Coll., Salt Lake City.
SPONS AGENCY	Utah State Office of Labor and Training, Salt Lake. Manpower and Employment Training Council.
PUB DATE	[83]
NOTE	148p.; Developed at the Skills Center, Utah Technical College.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Culture Conflict; *Employer Attitudes; Employment Interviews; Employment Qualifications; *Indochinese; *Job Performance; Language Proficiency; *Personnel Evaluation; *Refugees
IDENTIFIERS	*Utah

ABSTRACT

Eighty Utah companies currently hiring Indochinese refugees and 73 identified simply as "general employers" took part in a study of employers' reactions to Indochinese refugees as job applicants and as employees. The study used questionnaires and oral interviews directed at personnel managers and supervisors and some language proficiency tests of refugees. Reactions to the refugees were largely positive, with refugees who were employees being perceived more favorably than employees in general. Some problems related to language and (to a minor degree) cultural differences were identified. Personnel managers appeared to use information obtained through interviews less in the evaluation of refugees than in the evaluation of job applicants in general. This may have been due both to the difficulty of obtaining information and to the fact that personnel managers relied more on the reputation of refugees as a group in making evaluations. In terms of language, employers had relatively high expectations about the level of language proficiency that a refugee job applicant should demonstrate for a successful interview; listening was shown to be the most important language skill on the job, followed by speaking, reading, and writing. Appended to this report are the study questionnaire, interview schedule, cover letter, responses to the questionnaire, and an excerpt from "Program Design Considerations for English as a Second Language." (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED241664

INDUSTRY'S REACTIONS TO THE INDOCHINESE

by

John Latkiewicz

of the

Skills Center/Utah Technical College
Salt Lake City, Utah

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Latkiewicz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

for

The Manpower and Employment
Training Council/Utah Office
of Labor and Training

UD023446

under

CETA Title II Special Grants ACP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	3
The Government Position	3
Refugee Employment and Use of Public Assistance	4
The Research Literature	10
THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	12
METHODS	16
Design of the Research Instruments	16
Subjects	21
Procedures	22
RESULTS	24
Statistically Oriented Presentation of the Results	24
Non-Statistically Oriented Presentation of the Results	63
DISCUSSION	70
Quantitative Results in Light of the Qualitative Results	70
Implications for Service Providers	75
Conclusion	78
BIBLIOGRAPHY	80
APPENDIX A--The Research Questionnaire	82
APPENDIX B--Interview Schedule	94
APPENDIX C--Cover Letter	97
APPENDIX D--Responses to the Interview Questionnaire	102
APPENDIX E--Exerpt from Program Design Considerations for English as a Second Language	143

INTRODUCTION

A major thrust of the U.S. policy with regard to Indochinese refugees is directed toward employment and economic self-sufficiency which follows from employment. Unfortunately, adequate planning and accurate projections of the potential impact have not been possible for a number of reasons, including the suddenness of the onset of the refugee[1] influx (a geometrically progressive increase since 1975), the rather stark differences between the refugees' culture and that of the U.S. and the lack of precedence in recent history. While much has been learned by trial and error, and trial by fire, a need remains for information which will assist the various agencies which provide services to refugees in their effort to operate at a more optimal level.

The study presented here is a response to the above-outlined need for information. Based upon feedback from various service providers including social service/educational agencies and community based organizations, the study was designed to systematically identify employers' perceptions and needs as they relate to limited English speakers, more specifically the Indochinese refugee.

This research report first reviews the information and literature related to refugee employment/unemployment. This review is followed by an elaboration of the details of the study which includes discussion of the actual research questions, the design of the research instruments,

---

[1]Throughout this paper the term "refugee" will be used to mean Indochinese refugee.

and the actual procedures utilized in conducting the research. After an explication and analysis of the results, implications of the results for service providers are outlined.

BACKGROUND

The Government Position

The official federal governemnt position on refugee resettlement is stated in the Refugee Act of 1980 (House of Congress, 1980). The Act states that the Office of Refugee Resettlement has responsibility:

> (A) To make sufficient resources available for employment training and training and placement to ensure economic self-sufficiency among refugees 'as soon as possible';
>
> (B) to provide refugees with the opportunity for language training to enable rapid resettlement;
>
> (C) to ensure that cash assistance does not discourage economic self-sufficiency; . . . (Information Exchange Project, American Welfare Association, 1980, pp. 6-7)

In detailing this responsibility, the Act further indicates that states receiving assistance for refugee oriented programs must submit a plan which outlines:

> -- how the plan intends to encourage rapid economic self-sufficienty and effective resettlement
>
> -- how the state will ensure that language training and employment programs are made available to refugees receiving cash assistance. (Information Exchange Project, American Public Welfare Association, 1980, p. 7)

Employment and the economic self-sufficiency which follows from employment is then a major component of the government's position on refugees. This position has also been echoed in the National Indochinese Manpower Development Conference Resolutions (1979), in a document entitled Program Design Considerations for English as a Second Language (1980), in Refugee Reports (1979, 1980, 1981), and numerous other sources.

Refugee Employment and Use of Public Assistance

In order to provide background on the national scope of the problems associated with refugee employment, excerpts from Report to the Congress: Refugee Resettlement Program (Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Refugee Resettlement, 1981, pp. 9-10, 14-16, 29) are included here. The first relates to the use of cash assistance and the second refugee employment.

Cash Assistance

> Between August 1, 1979, and August 1, 1980 the proportion of the refugee population receiving cash assistance increased by 8.1 percentage points from 37.3 percent to 45.5 percent (Table 13, table number from the report). This compared with an increase of 4.2 percentage points the previous year. The higher proportion reflected the greatly increased number of new refugees entering the country. During this one-year period, 165,294 new refugees were resettled, compared with 60,969 during the previous year. Studies have consistently shown a direct relationship between eligibility for cash assistance and length of time in the United States.

TABLE 13

Southeast Asian Refugee Eligibility for Cash Assistance, Annual Comparisons: September 1975–August 1980[a]

	9/15/75	9/1/76	8/1/77	8/1/78	8/1/79	8/1/80
1. Number resettled in U.S.	92,274	138,058	146,743	162,214	223,183	388,477
2. Cash assistance cases	3,362	14,205	16,380	17,414	28,279	60,907
3. Increase in cases	I/R	10,843	2,175	1,034	10,865	32,628
4. Percentage increase in cases	I/R	323%	15%	6%	62%	115%
5. Cash assistance persons	10,969	41,188	50,771	53,644	83,312	176,314
6. Increase in persons	I/R	30,219	9,583	2,873	29,668	93,002
7. Percentage increase in persons	I/R	275%	23%	6%	55%	112%
8. Average number of persons per case	3.26	2.90	3.10	3.08	2.95	2.89
9. Average number of persons per new case	I/R	2.79	4.41	2.78	2.73	2.85
10. Percentage of population receiving cash assistance	11.89%	29.83%	34.60%	33.07%	37.33%	45.39%

[a] Data are for nearest available comparable annual dates.
I/R = initial report.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Refugee Employment

The Refugee Act identifies as a primary resettlement goal assisting refugees to become self-sufficient as quickly as possible. In order to assess refugee progress toward this goal, ORR has conducted research on refugee resettlement and employment over the past few years. As a group, refugees are moving steadily toward greater labor force participation and employment.

A national sample survey, conducted in October-November 1980, of Cambodian, Lao, and Vietnamese refugees who arrived in this country during 1975-1979, shows refugee employment rates closely comparable to those for the United States as a whole.

Labor Force participation rates of the Southeast Asian refugees aged 16 years and older show an increase with length of time in the country according to the October-November 1980 survey.

	Labor Force Participation Rate	
Year of Entry	Male	Female
1979	50.6%	23.9%
1978	58.3	31.5
1977	61.2	44.4
1976	66.0	42.0
1975	74.4	51.6
U.S. rate[a]	77.4	51.6

[a]U.S. labor participation rates according to BLS/DOL's November 1980 "seasonally adjusted figures."

The refugee labor force participation rates are lower than the U.S. rates, but the labor force participation rates of refugees who have been in the country for 5 years closely approach the U.S. rates. Compared with earlier surveys, the refugees who arrived from 1975-1977 show higher labor force participation rates in all subgroups in 1980 than in previous years.

It is of some significance that the sex differential in labor force participation and employment rates is similar in both the refugee and U.S. populations.

Work Force	Employment Rate		Unemployment Rate	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Cambodian	93.2%	91.1%	6.8%	8.9%
Lao	85.4	94.7	14.6	5.3
Vietnamese	92.0	92.1	8.0	7.9
U.S. work force[a]	92.6	92.3	7.4	7.7

[a]Figures are November 1980 "seasonally adjusted" figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) of the Department of Labor (DOL).

Data from the survey showed that refugees who are employed tend to work longer hours than the U.S. workers in general. A high percentage of employed refugees were working 35 or more hours per week:

Percent of Employed Refugees Working 35 or More Hours per Week[a]

Work Force	Male	Female	Total
Cambodian	91.6%	79.3%	87.7%
Lao	92.8	88.7	91.5
Vietnamese	87.2	81.6	85.7
U.S. workers[b]	93.5	75.7	84.8

[a]Refugee data from sample survey conducted by Opportunity Systems, Inc. 35 hours or more is now considered to be full-time employment by BLS/DOL.

[b]Figures are November 1980 "unadjusted" figures from BLS/DOL.

A majority of the employed refugees of each nationality had white-collar occupations in their home countries. The Vietnamese, who composed most of the 1975 wave of refugees, are most likely to have a professional background. Nearly 20 percent of the Cambodians were farmers in their home countries, while the Lao had the highest proportion of managerial employees, over 30 percent.

Occupational Profile of Refugees in Their Home Countries

Occupation	Cambodian	Lao	Vietnamese
White Collar			
Total	58.5%	66.8%	70.4%
Professional	17.4	14.2	22.5
Managerial	15.6	30.5	24.5
Sales	14.5	3.7	5.7
Clerical	11.0	18.4	17.7
Blue Collar			
Total	19.0	19.5	21.1
Skilled	4.6	6.8	8.7
Semi-Skilled	1.7	1.6	0.0
Truck Driver, etc.	2.9	5.3	1.5
Labor (non-farm)	9.8	5.8	10.9
Service Total	2.3	7.4	4.5
Farm Total	19.8	6.3	3.5

[a]Data from a survey conducted by Opportunity Systems, Inc., in October-November 1980.

Refugees are taking advantage of educational and training opportunities. Data collected by Opportunity Systems, Inc.* showed that 59.8 percent of the refugees interviewed who were age 16 and older gave school attendance as the primary reason for not looking for work. Homemaking was referenced by 26.1 percent, poor English by 21.2 percent, and poor health by 17.6 percent.

The data show that each additional year of residence increased the likelihood of employment. According to the Bachs' interpretation of the data: 'As of January 1979, after 4 years of residence, both men and women have reached virtually the same employment ratio as the U.S. population: 70 percent of male refugees were employed compared to 72.6 percent of the U.S. men; 46.1 percent of the female refugees and 46.6 percent of U.S. women were employed.'

The relationship of successful participation in the labor market to knowledge of English has been evidenced in all of the surveys of the Indochinese refugees since their arrival in the U.S. Survey results indicate the effect of proficiency in English on labor force participation and unemployment as shown above.

*As referenced by Robert L. Bach and Jennifer B. Bach in "Employment Patterns of Southeast Asian Refugees." Monthly Labor Review, October 1980, pp. 31-38.

Labor Market Indicator	Proficiency in Understanding English[a]				
	None	Few Words	Average	Good	Excellent
Labor force participation	19.4%	44.2%	61.9%	58.5%	76.7%
Unemployment rate	16.4%	14.4%	7.1%	4.4%	4.5%

[a]Data from a survey conducted by Opportunity Systems, Inc., in October-November 1980.

Specific information on refugee employment in Utah is not available. Presumably, however, the use of cash assistance should correlate with unemployment at least to some degree. The following table provides information on the use of cash assistance by refugees in Utah.

In examining Table 1, keep in mind that (a) the figures do not reflect secondary migration from or to the state, (b) the figures represent individuals including adults, children, elderly, handicapped, etc. Table 2 shows the degree of correlation between number of refugees resettled in Utah and use of cash assistance. As the table indicates, the relationship between number resettled and number using cash assistance is very strong.

Table 1

Use of Cash Assistance* by Refugees in Utah **

Month	Total # Refugees in State of Utah	AFDC							
		Regular		Unemployed		Program		Total	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
JAN/80	3093	151	4.9	47	1.5	720	23.3	918	29.7
FEB/80	3412	123	3.6	50	1.5	816	23.9	939	29.0
MAR/80	3730	179	4.8	69	1.9	839	22.4	1082	29.0
APR/80	4192	136	3.2	56	1.3	966	23.0	1158	27.6
MAY/80	4561	115	2.5	73	1.6	1034	22.7	1222	26.8
JUNE/80	4922	197	4.0	83	1.7	1025	20.8	1305	26.5
JULY/80	4903	108	2.2	110	2.2	1114	22.7	1332	27.2
AUG/80	5203	120	2.3	146	2.8	1244	23.9	1510	29.0
SEPT/80	5399	124	2.3	165	3.1	1399	25.9	1688	31.3
OCT/80	5613	148	2.6	213	3.8	1544	27.5	1905	33.9
NOV/80	5159	174	3.0	209	3.6	1591	27.6	1974	34.3
DEC/80	5890	147	2.5	255	4.3	1664	28.3	2066	35.1
JAN/81	5938	179	3.0	343	5.8	1659	27.9	2181	36.7
FEB/81	6028	181	3.0	402	6.6	1665	27.5	2248	37.1
APR/81	6187	341	3.9	426	6.9	1614	25.1	2281	36.9
MAY/81	6314	129	2.0	245	3.9	1833	28.1	2207	34.9
JUNE/81	6601	351	---	---***	---	1884	---	2265	---
JULY/81	6601	351	---	---	---	2034	---	2385	---
AUG/81	6804	343	---	---	---	2909	---	2433	---
SEPT/81	7131	347	---	---	---	2228	---	2575	---

NOTE: The table shows both actual number and percentages of refugee receiving cash assistance throughout the state.

*Figures on the number of refugees receiving cash assistance were obtained from the Department of Social Services, Office of Assistance Payments.

**Figures on the number of refugees were obtained from Refugee Reports (1980, 1981) and the Department of Social Services, Refugee Program.

***AFDC-Unemployed was discontinued.

Table 2

Statistical Tests for Number of Refugees in Utah Correlated with Use of Cash Assistance

	R	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Number/Use of AFDC-Regular	.62	.001	38
Number/Use of AFDC-Unemployed	.86	.000	24
Number/Use Refugee Program Cash Assistance	.97	.000	94
Number/Use of Cash Assistance Overall	.96	.000	92

The Research Literature

The statistics reveal only the general patterns of refugee employment and do not provide information of immediate utility to line level service. Unfortunately, the research literature on refugees is not much more helpful.

Bach and Bach (1980) provided a synopsis and analysis of data obtained by Opportunity Systems Inc. for the Department of Health and Human Services and from the annual Alien Address Registration conducted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. They found that most of the early Indochinese refugees found jobs and made slow but steady income gains. They also noted that more recent arrivals spoke less English and were likely to encounter more employment problems due to economic conditions. Stein (1979), again largely relying on data obtained through

Opportunity Systems, Inc. provided a comparison between the occupational adjustment of the Indochinese and other immigrant groups. As a result of the comparison and analysis, Stein developed a descriptive model of the occupational adjustment process. Finnan's (1980) research dealt with the occupational adjustment of one particular group of Vietnamese refugees from the perspective of the refugees themselves. Her article details the process by which these particular refugees came to identify with one particular industry, electronics.

While all three articles are well done and well worth reading, they do not address themselves to a detailed understanding of how refugees are being perceived by employers and how they are interfacing with the job market. Also, all three articles dealt with the refugee population which had arrived in the U.S. as of early 1978.

THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As indicated, there is widespread concern with making refugees and other immigrants economically self-sufficient and, as a consequence, a concern with how to accomplish this goal. On the line level, these concerns translate into a need to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of employment services (job development and job placement) and employment-related services (vocational training, job seeking skills training, ESL training, and basic skills training). As the background section indicates, there is little information available to assist service providers in their efforts to provide effective and efficient services.

In order to provide information of immediate utility to line level service providers and program designers, a study was conducted with the following objectives:

Identify personnel managers' and supervisors' perceptions of refugees as workers, or refugees' work habits, and of problems encountered in dealing with refugees.

Identify personnel managers' perceptions of refugees during job interviews.

Identify personnel managers' perceptions of the English language proficiency necessary for a successful interview.

Identify supervisors' perceptions of the English language proficiency level necessary for success on the job.

Identify the level of English language proficiency required by employers.

Identify employers' needs, concerns and recommendations concerning refugees as they relate to the labor market.

The decision to focus on personnel managers and supervisors was a pragmatic one; personnel managers and supervisors determine whether a

refugee will be employed and whether that refugee's job/language performance is adequate for successful employment. The distinction between personnel managers and supervisors also reflects the fact that an employer's reaction to a refugee can be broken into two phases: (1) A phase where initial impressions are formed during the application/interview process and (2) A phase where in-depth reactions to the ongoing performance of the employee develop. The interpersonal dynamics of each phase are quite distinct. The difference in phases is also paralleled by a functional and often physical distinction between personnel management and supervisory staff.

The decision to focus on language and culture was also pragmatic; language and culture are the salient features which distinguish the refugee from the native born American despite the cultural and dialectical diversity of native born Americans.

The above listed objectives and considerations translated into the following research questions.

1. To what degree do employers experience problems in dealing with refugee employees?

2. To what degree are the problems experienced with refugee employees experienced with employees in general?

3. In terms of work related personality/behavioral characteristics, how are refugee employees perceived?

4. In terms of work related personality/behavioral characteristics, how are refugee employees perceived in comparison to employees in general?

5. How important are the varying types of information (e.g., work experience, salary desired) gathered by employment interviews about refugee job applicants to an employment interviewer's evaluation of refugee job applicants?

6. Does the importance of those varying types of information change as a function of whether or not the applicant is a refugee?

7. How easy or difficult is it for employment interviewers to obtain those varying types of information from refugee job applicants.

8. On the basis of their behavior in a job interview (e.g., eye contact, confidence), how are refugee job applicants evaluated by employment interviewers?

9. On the basis of their behavior in a job interview how are refugee job applicants evaluated by employment interviewers in comparison to job applicants in general?

10. What are employment interviewers' expectations with regard to the oral English language proficiency needed for a successful interview?

11. What are employment interviewers' expectations with regard to the written English language proficiency needed for successfully filling out a job application?

12. To what degree are speaking, listening, reading and writing (each as a separate skill) involved in jobs which refugees are likely to obtain?

13. What is the English language proficiency of refugees currently being hired?

14. What employers' needs, concerns and recommendations with regard to the employment of refugees?

15. How do the answers to these questions vary as a function of:

    (a) whether the person answering acts in the capacity of personnel manager, supervisor or both;

    (b) The size of the company;

    (c) the product/service provided by the company;

    (d) the company's overall perception of refugee employees; and

    (e) the company's willingness to hire refugees in the future?

Before discussing the actual research methods, a methodological assumption needs to be mentioned. An assumption of the study is that both a quantitative and a qualitative approach should be used in answering the research questions. The study is quantitative in that employers were asked to make quantitative judgments, i.e., they filled out a written questionnaire asking them to mark points on a scale which could be given a numerical value. This approach has the advantages of reliability, case of data

analysis, and comparability of respondents' answers. One disadvantage is that this approach reduces respondents' perceptions to numbers, thereby losing much of the richness of their perceptions. Another disadvantage is that numerical results must inevitably be interpreted since they are so abstract. This introduces the possibility of bias.

The study is qualitative in that oral interviews were conducted with employers. These interviews consisted of a series of open-ended questions. The data gathered in this manner takes the form of unrestricted verbal responses rather than points on a scale. This approach preserves the richness of the respondents' perceptions. At the same time, it is subject to interpretations due to the ambiguity of open-ended verbal responses. Qualitative data also makes data analysis difficult since the responses cannot be "summed" or easily compared.

In the present study, both types of data were gathered in order to provide a balance between quantitative and qualitative data.

METHODS

Design of the Research Instruments

Written Questionnaire

The research instruments in general, and the written questionnaire in particular, were designed to explore four related areas of refugee performance:

Interview performances -- language

Interview performance -- culture

On-the-job performance -- language

On-the-job performance -- culture

In devising the questionnaire items to cover these areas, a number of resources were used which included Interviewing Principles and Practices (Stewart & Cash, 1978), Group Job Seeking Course Guide (Perschau, 1980), Understanding and Using Communication in Business (Bowman & Branchaw, 1977), Janus Job Interview Kit (Jew & Tony, 1976), and It's Up to You: Language Skills and Strategies for Getting a Job (Dresner, Beck, Carter, & Morgano, 1980). Comments from service providers were also used as a resource. A review of these materials and comments generated a list of:

21 areas explored by interviewers through the use of oral questions,

15 interviewee behaviors (verbal and non-verbal) used to evaluate applicants;

14 employee behaviors which cause problems for employers;

The review also suggested dimensions/characteristics (e.g., responsible-irresponsible, trustworthy-untrustworthy, etc.) along which employers evaluate employees. In order to generate a list of additional dimensions

which are potentially work related, the California Personality Inventory (Gough, H. G., 1957) and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1959) were examined. This examination generated a list of 36 potentially work related dimensions/characteristics.

The second phase of the written questionnaire's development consisted of obtaining feedback from actual personnel managers and line level supervisors regarding the items. Twenty randomly selected companies were chosen. Personnel manager/supervisors were asked to review the lists generated and select items that were important to them. Prior to examining the list, these individuals were asked the following six open-ended questions orally:

1. What kind of problems do you find you have with employees?
2. Please finish the following phrase in the ways that occur to you. 'A good employee is motivated to. . . .'
3. What characteristics come to mind when you think of your good workers? Poor workers?
4. In an initial interview, what information do you feel is most important for you to obtain in order to make a decision about the applicant?
5. What sort of interview behaviors cause you to form a good impression of the applicant?
6. What kinds of things in an interview cause you to form a negative impression of the applicant?

These questions were asked in order to determine if any additional items should be included in the questionnaire. This review process served to establish the validity of the items utilized on the final form of the written questionnaire.

The above process generated a list of:

7 areas explored by interviewers through the use of oral questions;

9 interview behaviors used to evaluate applicants;

9 employee behaviors which cause problems for employers;

9 work-related dimensions/characteristics.

In the final form of the written questionnaire, employers were asked to evaluate their employees using Likert/Semantic Differential type scales. Two examples of these scales are provided below:

Example 1:

Application Is Filled Out Completely

Is___ = ___ = ___ = ___ = ___ = ___ = ___ Is not

Example 2:

Ambitious___ = ___ = ___ = ___ = ___ = ___ = ___ Unambitious

Personnel managers and supervisors were asked to check the space which best indicated their overall evaluation of either their typical employee or typical refugee employee.

In addition to the above questions, additional items were included in order to ascertain the following:

(a) Company demographics

--number of employees
--job title of the person responding to the questionnaire
--type of industry/product or service provided

(b) Overall evaluation of Indochinese workers

(c) Willingness to hire Indochinese workers

(d) Expectations about refugee applicants' abilities to handle the application process

(e) Expectations about refugee applicants' abilities to handle the interview process

(f) Company's interest in on-site language training for its employees

(g) The degree to which speaking, listening, reading, and writing are involved in entry level and semi-skilled positions.

(a), (b), and (c) were ascertained so that comparisons between companies and between personnel managers' and supervisors' perceptions could be made. (d), (e), (f), and (g) were explored as a result of specific provider concerns and suggestions. Copies of the written questionnaire are provided in Appendix B.

Oral Interview Schedule

An oral interview consisting of fourteen questions for personnel managers and fifteen questions for supervisors was also conducted with employers who were identified as those employing refugees. The list of questions is provided in Appendix C. As noted earlier, the oral interviews were conducted so as to provide a qualitative counterpart to the quantitatively oriented written questionnaire. The oral interview also allowed some specific service provider concerns (e.g., special requirements for employment such as citizenship) to be addressed in an atmosphere suitable for exploring details, motivations, obtaining examples and insuring clarity.

The questions contained in the oral interview schedule were designed that:

(a) the order of the questions moved from general to specific

(b) the respondents were forced to go beyond a simple "yes" or "no"

(c) the questions did not suggest direction for the answers to take

(d) the questions avoided implicit presumptions and value judgments about either the respondent or their refugee employees.

Test of Language Proficiency

Information relating to the specific English language proficiency level of recent refugees hired was also obtained. In choosing a test instrument, the following constraints and considerations were taken into account:

(a) constraints imposed by employer needs

--a maximum of 20 minutes for test administration

--administration could take place in the actual work area

(b) test reliability

(c) ease of administration

--not subject to researcher judgments in less than ideal conditions

--basic test format is familiar to individuals being tested

(d) ease of interpretation (familiar to service providers)

(e) easily obtainable (for purposes of replication of the study if so desired)

(f) validity

Given this list of constraints and considerations, a variation of Structure Tests--English Language (STEL) (Best & Illyin, 1978) was selected. The STEL test consists of two sets of tests for each of three proficiency levels. Each form consists of fifty items. The administration time for each form is thirty minutes. The average reliability figure for the six forms of the test is .873.

It was estimated that the majority of individuals to be tested in the present study would fall within the beginning and intermediate range. In order to produce an instrument which reflects this range and which has a maximum administration time of twenty minutes, every fourth question from the list of 100 questions comprising the beginning and intermediate test (form I) was selected. This process produced a twenty-five question test with an approximate administration time of fifteen minutes.

Subjects

A total of 195 employers were contacted. One hundred and fifteen of these had been identified as employing refugees either currently or in the past. Eighty were simply identified as employers and were considered as employers in general, regardless of whether they employed refugees presently or in the past.

The sample includes employers in Utah's three major urban areas--Salt Lake City, Provo, and Ogden. The Division of Family Services estimates that approximately 50% of Utah's refugee population reside in the Salt Lake area, 22.5% in the Provo area, and 15% in the Ogden area. The number of respondents from each area (broken down by general employer/refugee employer) are provided in the table below:

Table 3

Respondents Broken Down by
Type of Employer and Location

	Salt Lake City Area		Provo Area		Ogden Area	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
General Employer	63	81	5	7	5	7
Refugee Employer	63	85	8	15	9	15

Employers included in the general employer's sample were randomly selected from the Directory of Utah Manufacturers (Department of Employment Security, 1980) and the Employer List (Salt Lake Area Chamber of Commerce, 1980). Refugee employers were selected randomly from lists provided by

various refugee resettlement agencies and other agencies dealing with refugee job placement.

Procedures

The data collection procedures for employers of refugees differ from those for employers not specifically identified as employing refugees. The two sets of procedures will be considered separately.

General Employers

Initial contact with each personnel office (or an individual serving a personnel function) was made via the telephone. The data collector identified himself, his institutional affiliation, and the overall purpose of the study. The personnel manager was asked if he/she would be willing to fill out a questionnaire which asked questions regarding his/her perceptions of applicants for jobs and/or actual employees. No mention of the refugee focus was made. Anonymity was assured. Of the 95 companies contacted, 73 agreed to participate.

If the supervisor function was separated from that of personnel manager, the supervisor was also contacted. Of the 73 companies participating, the supervisor and personnel manager functions were separate in 52 of the companies.

A questionnaire, instructions for filling it out, and a stamped address envelope for return of the questionnaire was personally delivered to each of the participants. Neither oral interviews nor language proficiency tests were conducted with any of the employees.

Refugee Employers

Initial contact with the company was made in a manner similar to that described in the previous section. However, the focus on refugees was

explicitly mentioned. In addition to filling out the questionnaire, the prospective participants were asked if they would be willing to be interviewed face-to-face and if they would allow the two refugees most recently hired to take an English language proficiency test. Of the 115 companies contaced, 80 agreed to fill out the questionnaire and be interviewed. Of the companies contacted, 38 were willing to have their two most recent refugee hires take the test. In 35 of the 80 companies participating, the personnel managers' and supervisors' functions were separate.

If the personnel manager/supervisor agreed to participate, a time was arranged for the interview. Personnel managers and supervisors were interviewed separately if the two functions were performed by separate individuals. The oral interview was always conducted before the written questionnaire via the stamped addressed return envelope.

Following the oral interviews, the data collector proceeded with the English language proficiency test phase. The data collector introduced himself to each employee identified as recently hired and presented the individual with a short letter outlining the purpose of the study and test and the research project's institutional affiliation. This letter was written in the employee's native language. It also contained directions for filling out the test. (A copy of the English version of this letter is included as an Appendix). Each employee was given the opportunity to refuse to take the test. Of the 63 employees contacted, 0 refused to participate. The employees were then given fifteen minutes to complete the test.

De-briefing of the Subjects

Each employer participating in the research project was mailed a short letter which outlined the purpose and results of the study.

RESULTS

The quantitative analysis of the research questions is presented in the Discussion section which follows the Results section. The first part of the results presentation assumes at least a passing acquaintance with statistical forms of analysis. The second part presents the same information as the first part, but without the details of the statistical procedures and without the detailed chart. Readers may wish to skip the first part.

Statistically Oriented Presentation of the Results

The .05 level will be used as the significance level throughout the presentation. Where a statistical test produced a significant result, a "variance accounted for" percentage is also reported.

Several of the analyses are based on a comparison of employers who had been identified as employing refugees and employers who had not been identified as employing refugees. The former were asked to evaluate their refugee employees while the latter were asked to evaluate their employees in general. In many instances, a significant difference was found between the two groups of employers. A question arises, however: does the difference reflect a difference between who is being evaluated or a difference between the two groups of employers per se? The former is the intention of the study. The question was resolved in the following way.

Employers who were not identified as employing refugees were asked whether they had in fact employed refugees. Twenty-four of the eighty respondents had indeed employed refugees. The "had employed" employers' evaluations of employees in general were then compared to the "had not

employed" employers' evaluations of employees in general. If the two groups were fundamentally different, the difference should show up in their evaluations of different facets of employee behavior. Table 4 shows the results of the statistical analyses of these comparisons. As the table demonstrates, there is not even the slightest hint of a statistical difference between the two groups' evaluations. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that the differences between employers that emerge in exploring the research questions do reflect a difference in the population being evaluated rather than in the evaluators.

Table 4

Statistical Tests for Problem (Overall), Worker Characteristics (Overall), Importance of Interview Information (Overall), and Type of Non-Refugee Evaluating Employee

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Problems	13.51	1	.16	.688	---
Worker Characteristics	52.10	1	.85	.359	---
Importance of Interview Information	26.09	1	1.41	.240	---
Behavior in an Interview	35.58	1	.36	.552	---

Research questions 1 and 2 deal with the degree to which employers experience problems with employees. Table 5 gives refugee and general employers' responses in terms of means and standard deviations. (A refugee employer is an employer evaluating refugee employees. A general employer is an employer evaluating employees in general.) Responses to specific problems can range from 1 (have experienced the problems) to 7 (have not experienced the problem). The evaluations are higher for refugee than for employees in general in 8 out of 9 instances.

In order to determine the significance of the differences between employers' evaluations, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Table 6 displays the results. With the exception of "Employees having problems getting transportation to and from work," the comparisons produced a statistically significant difference with refugee employees being evaluated more positively than employees in general.

For exploratory purposes, analyses were also conducted to determine if the evaluation of refugees with regard to "problems" varies as a function of the type and size of the business or industry, position of respondent (personnel manager only, supervisor, or both personnel manager and supervisor), willingness to hire refugees in the future and overall evaluation of refugees as employees. (Due to the large number of comparisons being made, a summation of the responses to individual problems was used. The summation was broken down into its components and tested only in the event the analysis was significant for the summation.) Tables 7 and 8 illustrate the results of these exploratory analyses. Only willingness to hire in the future was statistically and positively related to evaluation of problems. The relationship is further defined in Table 9 where "problems"

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Problems Broken Down by Type of Employer

	Refugee		General	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Inability to Get Along with Fellow Workers	5.75	1.50	3.70	1.50
Unexcused Absences	5.54	1.87	3.10	1.58
Being Late for Work	6.05	1.41	2.78	1.41
Quitting without Notice	5.11	2.06	3.78	1.88
Instability of Employment	5.27	1.96	3.68	1.63
Inability to Get Along with Supervisory Personnel	6.05	1.19	4.28	1.41
Problems Getting Transportation	4.59	2.14	4.74	1.63
Being Absent or Late Due to Problems with Child Care	5.65	1.76	4.01	1.82
Depression or Anxiety	5.29	1.77	4.41	1.57
Problems Overall	49.32	10.83	35.27	9.09

Table 6

Statistical Tests for Problems as a Function of Type of Employer

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Inability to Get Along with Fellow Workers	194.56	1	86.67	.0000	32
Unexcused Absences	280.26	1	95.84	.0000	34
Being Late for Work	507.88	1	256.61	.0000	58
Quitting Without Notice	85.28	1	21.96	.0000	11
Instability of Employment	117.79	1	36.40	.0000	16
Inability to Get Along with Supervisory Personnel	146.94	1	86.23	.0000	32
Problems Getting Transportation to and from Work	1.20	1	.33	.564	--
Being Absent or Late Due to Problems with Child Care	125.29	1	39.08	.0000	18
Depression or Anxiety	36.44	1	13.01	.0004	01
Problems Overall	10574.36	1	106.13	.0000	37

Table 7

Statistical Test for Problems (Overall) as a Function of Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Business or Industry	81.18	3	.68	.570	--
Size of Business or Industry	90.66	2	.75	.474	--
Position of Respondent	23.34	2	1.9	.824	--

NOTE: Interaction effects could not be obtained due to empty cells.

Table 8

Statistical Tests for Problems (Overall) Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future, and Overall Evaluation of Refugee Employees

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Problems/ Willingness	.33	.000	11
Problems/ Evaluation	-.13	.113	--

Table 9

Statistical Tests for Problems (Individual) Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Inability to Get Along with Fellow Workers	.23	.005	5
Unexcused Absences	.27	.001	7
Being Late for Work	.25	.003	6
Quitting Without Notice	.16	.037	3
Instability of Employment	.25	.002	6
Inability to Get Along with Supervisory Personnel	.21	.010	4
Employees Having Problems Getting Transportation	.21	.010	4
Being Absent or Late Due to Problems with Child Care	.26	.002	7
Depression or Anxiety	.29	.000	9

is broken down into its component parts. As Table 9 indicated, the relationship between willingness to hire and evaluation carries through each of the individual problems.

Research questions 3 and 4 focus on how employers evaluate their employees in terms of work related behavioral/psychological characteristics. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 10. Responses to specific characteristics can range from 1 (a negative evaluation) to 7 (a positive evaluation). Refugees are consistently evaluated more positively than employees in general.

Also note that the standard deviations are consistently smaller for refugees indicating less variability in the evaluation of employers. Implications for this finding will be explored in the discussion section.

When ANOVAS were done on the responses of the two groups, statistical significance resulted in every instance (Table 11).

Analyses of the relationship between worker characteristic and type and size of business or industry, position of respondent, willingness to hire and overall evaluation, again produced only one statistically significant results. (See Tables 12 and 13.) Willingness to hire is positively correlated with a positive evaluation on worker characteristics.

Table 14 shows that willingness to hire is also positively correlated with every individual worker characteristic with one exception.

The importance of interview information in evaluated job applicants is the focus of research question 5 and 6. Table 15 gives the means and standard deviations. Responses to specific types of interview information can range from 1 (not important) to 7 (important). Information is, in all cases, more important for evaluating employees in general than for refugees.

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for Worker Characteristics Broken Down by Type of Employer

	Refugee		General	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Ambitious/ Unambitious	5.59	1.03	4.82	1.25
Enthusiastic Attitude/ Negative Attitude	5.36	.98	4.56	1.26
Responsible/ Immature	5.84	.91	4.92	1.16
Thorough/ Haphazard	5.76	.96	4.84	1.06
Cooperative/ Uncooperative	6.08	.89	5.34	.91
Reliable/ Unreliable	6.21	.85	5.13	.95
Honest/ Dishonest	6.16	.94	5.42	1.11
Industrious/ Lazy	5.97	.97	4.90	1.22
Trustworthy/ Untrustworthy	6.07	.92	5.41	1.00
Worker Characheristics Overall	52.73	6.35	45.27	7.83

Table 11

Statistical Tests for Worker Characteristics as a Function of Type of Employer

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Ambitious/ Unambitious	27.73	1	20.92	.0000	10
Enthusiastic Attitude/ Negative Attitude	30.10	1	23.42	.0000	11
Responsible/ Immature	40.23	1	36.80	.0000	17
Thorough/ Haphazard	38.95	1	38.06	.0000	17
Cooperative/ Uncooperative	25.54	1	31.57	.0000	15
Reliable/ Unreliable	54.54	1	67.46	.0000	27
Honest/ Dishonest	25.73	1	24.32	.0000	12
Industrious/ Lazy	53.78	1	44.05	.0000	19
Trustworthy/ Untrustworthy	19.97	1	21.79	.0000	11
Worker Characteristics Overall	2597.26	1	50.95	.0000	22

Table 12

Statistical Tests for Worker Characteristics (Overall) as a Function of Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Business or Industry	52.60	3	1.35	.263	--
Size of Business or Industry	77.76	2	2.00	.142	--
Position of Respondent	46.73	2	1.20	.306	--

NOTE: Interaction effects could not be obtained due to empty cells.

Table 13

Statistical Tests for Worker Characteristics (Overall) Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future, and Overall Evaluation of Refugee Employees

	r	Probability	R^2
Worker Characteristics/ Willingness	.33	.000	11
Worker Characteristics/ Evaluation	.16	.070	--

Table 14

Statistical Tests for Worker Characteristics (Individual) Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Ambitious/ Unambitious	.08	.190	--
Enthusiastic Attitude/ Negative Attitude	.28	.001	6
Responsible/ Immature	.24	.004	6
Thorough/ Haphazard	.25	.003	6
Cooperative Uncooperative	.23	.005	5
Reliable/ Unreliable	.33	.000	11
Honest/ Dishonest	.18	.020	3
Industrious/ Lazy	.18	.021	3
Trustworthy/ Untrustworthy	.22	.007	5

Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations for Importance of Interview Information Broken Down by Type of Employer

	Refugee		General	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Salary Desired	4.20	1.55	5.18	1.42
Educational Background and Training	4.30	1.60	5.20	1.41
Reasons for Leaving Previous Jobs	5.53	1.59	6.22	.89
Frequency of Job Changes	5.91	1.40	6.30	.85
Ability to Get Along with People	5.56	1.41	6.03	.94
Related Work Experience	4.94	1.9	5.47	1.19
Other Work Experience	3.91	1.47	4.47	1.46
Information Overall	34.34	6.79	38.87	4.32

As the standard deviations indicate the evaluations were, however, more variable for refugees than for employees in general. Table 16 shows that the relationship is statistically significant for 5 of the 7 types of information considered in the study.

When importance of interview information was analyzed in terms of type and size of business or industry, position of respondent, willingness to hire and overall evaluation no statistically significant results emerged. Tables 17 and 18 provide the results of these analyses.

Table 16

Statistical Tests for Importance of Information as a Function of Type of Employer

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted (%)
Salary Desired	29.75	1	13.48	.0004	x10
Educational Background and Training	25.26	1	11.05	.0012	8
Reasons for Leaving Previous Jobs	14.55	1	8.61	.0040	7
Frequency of Job Changes	4.80	1	3.53	.0627	--
Ability to Get Along with People	6.87	1	4.71	.0319	4
Related Work Experience	8.67	1	3.41	.0674	--
Other Work Experience	9.73	1	4.56	.0346	4
Importance of Information Overall	633.50	1	19.30	.0000	14

Table 17

Statistical Tests for Importance of Interview Information (Overall) as a Function of Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted (%)
Type of Business or Industry	24.68	3	.51	.677	--
Size of Business or Industry	20.34	2	.42	.659	--
Position of Respondent	10.97	1	.23	.636	--

NOTE: Interaction effects could not be obtained due to empty cells.

Table 18

Statistical Tests for Importance of Interview Information (Overall) Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future, and Overall Evaluation of Refugee Employees

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Importance/Willingness	-.03	.379	--
Importance/Evaluation	-.17	.056	--

Table 19

Means and Standard Deviations for Ease of Obtaining Interview Information (Overall)

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Salary Desired	4.65	1.54
Education Background and Training	3.75	1.56
Reasons for Leaving Previous Jobs	3.27	1.38
Frequency of Job Changes	3.64	1.52
Ability to Get Along with People	3.30	1.73
Related Work Experience	3.89	1.57
Other Work Experience	3.03	1.33
Ease Overall	15.64	5.44

The seventh research question deals with the ease of obtaining information in an interview from refugee applicants. Table 19 displays the means and standard deviations. For individual items, the responses can range from 1 (difficult) to 7 (easy). The results indicate that with the exception of salary desired, individuals in a personnel manager position on the average do experience a slight amount of difficulty in obtaining the different types of information. As shown in Table 20, this difficulty does not, however, vary as a function of the type or size of business or industry or the position of the respondent. Table 21 shows that overall ease of obtaining information is correlated with willingness to hire in the future, but not with overall evaluation.

Table 20

Statistical Tests for Ease of Obtaining Interview Information (Overall) as a Function of Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Business or Industry	19.19	3	.61	.610	--
Size of Business or Industry	3.71	2	.12	.889	--
Position of Respondent	17.39	1	.551	.460	--

Table 21

Statistical Tests for Ease of Obtaining Interview Information (Overall) Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future, and Overall Evaluation of Refugee Employees

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Ease/Willingness	.21	.009	4
Ease/Evaluation	-.09	.199	---

While the correlation of overall ease with willingness to hire is statistically significant, ease of obtaining information, when broken down into its component items, does not correlate with willingness to hire to any statistically significant degree. (See Table 22.)

Research question 8 and 9 focus on how employees are evaluated on the basis of their interpersonal style and non-verbal behavior in an interview. Table 23 shows the mean and standard deviations, while Table 24 shows the results of the statistical comparisons of the evaluations refugee and non-refugee employees. Evaluator responses could range from 1 to 7 with 1 being a negative evaluation and 7 being a positive evaluation. Unlike previous comparisons, refugee employees were not consistently evaluated higher than non-refugee employees. Neither were they consistently evaluated lower. In 5 instances they were evaluated higher: does not overemphasize money and benefits, come to the interview on time, grooming and clothing are appropriate, polite, and appears to answer questions honestly. The statistical analysis reveals a significant difference in the first four items. In 4 instance, refugee employees were evaluated lower: appears to be well motivated, application is filled out completely, application is filled out neatly, and maintains good eye contact. In 2 of these instances, application is filled out completely and maintains good eye contact, the differences proved to be significant statistically.

As a follow-up to the previous analyses, interviewers' overall evaluations of refugees' behavior in an interview were analyzed in relationship to the type and size of business or industry, the position of the respondent, willingness to hire in the future and overall evaluation. The results are presented in Tables 25 and 26. Only willingness to hire in the future proved

Table 22

Statistical Tests for Ease of Obtaining Interview Information (Individual) Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Salary Desired	.07	.285	--
Educational Background and Training	.04	.392	--
Reasons for Leaving Previous Job	.11	.201	--
Frequency of Job Changes	.12	.171	--
Ability to Get Along with People	.08	.271	--
Related Work Experience	.00	.496	--
Other Work Experience	.18	.072	--

Table 23

Means and Standard Deviations for Behavior in an Interview (Individual) Broken Down by Type of Employer

	Refugee		General	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Appears to be Well-Motivated	4.64	1.56	4.84	1.47
Application is Filled Out Completely	3.00	1.76	4.72	1.71
Does Not Over-emphasize Money and Benefits	5.77	1.31	3.74	1.62
Comes to the Interview On Time	6.08	1.14	5.66	1.22
Grooming and Clothing are Appropriate	5.41	1.55	4.82	1.66
Application is Filled Out Neatly	4.02	1.71	4.33	1.70
Polite	6.5	.87	5.39	1.32
Appears to Answer Questions Honestly	5.98	1.45	5.59	1.24
Maintains Good Eye Contact	3.64	1.62	4.31	1.64
Behavior Overall	44.80	6.28	43.53	9.91

Table 24

Statistical Tests for Behavior in an Interview as a Function of Type of Employer

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Appears to be Well-Motivated	1.25	1	.54	.4620	--
Application is Filled Out Completely	92.54	1	30.74	.0000	20
Does Not Over-emphasize Money or Benefits	128.44	1	59.55	.0000	33
Comes to the Interview On Time	5.56	1	3.98	.0482	3
Grooming and Clothing are Appropriate	10.75	1	4.18	.0431	3
Application is Filled Out Neatly	3.02	1	1.04	.3102	--
Polite	38.24	1	30.83	.0000	20
Appears to Answer Questions Honestly	4.85	1	3.40	.0677	--
Maintains Good Eye Contact	14.06	1	5.31	.0229	11
Behavior in an Interview Overall	48.44	1	.73	.3947	--

Table 25

Statistical Tests for Behavior in an Interview (Overall) as a Function of Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Business or Industry	64.59	3	1.67	.183	--
Size of Business or Industry	2.67	2	.07	.933	--
Position of Respondent	58.38	1	1.51	.224	--

Table 26

Statistical Tests for Behavior in an Interview (Overall) Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future, and Overall Evaluation of Refugee Employees

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Behavior/Willingness	.21	.011	4
Behavior/Evaluation	.15	.082	---

to be significantly related. Interviewers' evaluations of refugees in terms of each separate behavior were therefore analyzed in relationship to willingness to hire in the future. As illustrated in Table 27, five of the nine behaviors were significantly and positively correlated with willingness to hire in the future. In order of the strength of the correlations, these five items were polite, grooming and clothing are appropriate, application is filled out neatly, comes to the interview on time, and does not overemphasize money and benefits.

Research questions 10 and 11 deal with the level of English language proficiency needed in an interview. Employers were asked to respond to three questionnaire items:

> Would you allow an Indochinese interviewee to bring a translator to an interview and to answer questions through the translator? (Responses can range from 0 (no) to 1 (yes).)
>
> Which of these statements best describes your expectations about Indochinese interviewees' (oral) English language skills? (Responses can range from 1 (no language skills are required) to 5 (answer all questions and speak nearly as well as a native-born English speaker).)
>
> Which of these statements (about written language proficiency best describes your expectations about Indochinese interviewees' ability to fill out the application form? (Responses can range from 1 (translator can fill out the application) to 5 (applicant must be able to fill out the entire application by themselves).)

The means and standard deviations for the responses to these questions are reported in Table 28. As indicated, 71% of the respondents indicated that they would not allow a translator to be brought and to answer the questions. In terms of the second question about oral proficiency, the mean response fell closest to "They must be able to answer all questions even though there are still errors in vocabulary choice and grammar." The mean response to the third question dealing with written

Table 27

Statistical Tests for Behavior in an Interview (Individual) Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Appears to be Well-Motivated	.10	.135	--
Application is Filled Out Completely	.02	.413	--
Does Not Over-emphasize Money and Benefits	.15	.049	2
Comes to the Interview on Time	.16	.040	3
Grooming and Clothing are Appropriate	.21	.021	4
Application is Filled Out Neatly	.20	.014	4
Polite	.26	.002	7
Appears to Answer Questions Honestly	.07	.228	--
Maintains Good Eye Contact	.08	.191	--

Table 28

Means and Standard Deviations for Use of Translator in an Interview, Oral Proficiency Needed in an Interview, and Written Proficiency Needed for Job Applications

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Use of Translator	.29	.45
Oral Proficiency Needed	3.67	.94
Written Proficiency Needed	3.17	.81

proficiency on an application fell closest to "They must be able to fill out most of the application by themselves without using a translator."

As a follow-up, responses to the above discussed questions were compared according to the type and size of the business or industry, the position of the respondent, willingness to hire in the future, and overall evaluation. As the results (see Tables 29-35) indicate, only one significant finding emerged. Responses to the second question concerning oral proficiency varied as a function of size. As Table 31 illustrates, medium-sized companies required the highest level of proficiency while small companies required the lowest level.

The twelfth research question focuses on the importance of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Responses for each can range from 1 (not important) to 7 (important). As Table 36 shows, four language skills were evaluated from at least somewhat important to very important. The order of importance was listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Table 29

Statistical Tests for Use of a Translator in an Interview as a Function of Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Business or Industry	.03	3	.21	.890	--
Size of Business or Industry	.27	2	1.98	.148	--
Position of Respondent	.00	1	.02	.887	--

NOTE: Interaction effects could not be obtained due to empty cells.

Table 30

Statistical Tests for Oral Proficiency Needed in an Interview as a Function of Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Business or Industry	.72	3	.86	.468	--
Size of Business or Indsutry	3.21	2	3.85	.027	12
Position of Respondent	2.03	1	2.43	.124	--

NOTE: Interaction effects could not be obtained due to empty cells.

Table 31

Means and Standard Deviations for Oral Proficiency Needed in an Interview Broken Down by Size of Business or Industry

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Small	3.35	.94
Medium	3.94	.87
Large	3.85	.93

Table 32

Statistical Tests for Written Proficiency Needed for Job Applications as a Function of Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Business or Industry	.16	3	.24	.866	--
Size of Business or Industry	1.26	2	1.88	.162	--
Position of Respondent	.77	1	1.15	.289	--

Table 33

Statistical Tests for Use of Translator Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future, and Overall Evaluation of Refugee Employees

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Translator/ Willingness	.15	.067	--
Translator/ Evaluation	-.22	.019	--

Table 34

Statistical Tests for Oral Proficiency Needed in an Interview Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future, and Overall Evaluation of Refugee Employees

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Oral Proficiency/ Willingness	.12	.180	--
Oral Proficiency/ Evaluation	-.08	.255	--

Table 35

Statistical Tests for Written Proficiency Needed for Job Applications Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future, and Overall Evaluation of Refugee Employees

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Written Proficiency/ Willingness	.14	.129	--
Written Proficiency/ Evaluation	-.14	.136	--

Table 36

Means and Standard Deviations for Importance of Speaking, Listening, Reading, and Writing

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Speaking	5.36	1.56
Listening	6.12	1.48
Reading	4.62	1.58
Writing	4.16	1.78

Follow-up analyses were conducted in order to determine if type of employer, type and size of business or industry, position of respondent, willingness to hire in the future, and overall evaluation were significantly related. Tables 37, 38, 39, 41, and 43 display the results. In the case of reading and writing, a statistically significant difference was discovered between employers who had been identified as employing the Indochinese and those who had not been so identified. In both cases, non-refugee employers evaluated reading and writing as slightly more important than refugee employers. (See Tables 40 and 42.)

As Tables 39 and 40 show, respondents who were a supervisor only evaluated reading as being slightly more important than respondents who were both supervisor and personnel manager did. With regard to reading, position of respondent was, however, found to interact with size of business or industry. For individuals who were supervisors only, the larger the company the more important reading was. For individuals who were both supervisor and personnel manager, the larger the company the less important reading was.

In terms of willingness to hire in the future, only listening was found to be correlated. In terms of overall evaluation, reading and writing were found to be correlated. All three correlations were positive.

The actual level of English language proficiency of refugees being hired is addressed in research question 13. The results of the test given to 63 refugee employees produced a mean score of 10.691 with a standard deviation of 5.964. Additional background information on these scores and their meaning and implications will be outlined in the Discussion section. Since the responses to research question 14 take a qualitative

Table 37

Statistical Tests for Importance of Speaking as a Function of Type of Employer, Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Employer	1.52	1	.58	.448	--
Type of Business or Industry	2.79	3	1.06	.370	--
Size of Business or Industry	.68	2	.26	.774	--
Position of Respondent	.01	1	.01	.947	--
Type of Empl. x Type of Business or Industry	.11	3	.04	.989	--
Type of Empl. x Size	2.05	2	.78	.461	--
Type of Empl. x Position	.11	1	.04	.841	--
Type of Business or Industry x Size	1.03	6	.39	.883	--
Type of Business or Industry x Position	1.73	3	.66	.579	--
Size x Position	2.83	2	1.08	.346	--

Table 38

Statistical Tests for Importance of Listening as a Function of Type of Employer, Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Employer	.13	1	.13	.059	--
Type of Business or Industry	.47	3	.20	.898	--
Size of Business or Industry	.68	2	.29	.753	--
Position of Respondent	1.86	1	.78	.379	--
Type of Empl. x Type of Business or Industry	1.41	3	.59	.622	--
Type of Empl. x Size	1.99	2	.84	.434	--
Type of Empl. x Position	.01	1	.00	.957	--
Type of Business or Industry x Size	.94	6	.40	.880	--
Type of Business or Industry x Position	1.40	3	.59	.624	--
Size x Position	.94	2	.39	.676	--

Table 39

Statistical Tests for Importance of Reading as a Function of Type of Employer, Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Employer	8.08	1	4.12	.046	3
Type of Business or Industry	4.31	3	2.20	.094	--
Size of Business or Industry	4.10	2	2.09	.130	
Position of Respondent	8.90	1	4.54	.036	3
Type of Empl. x Type of Business or Industry	2.03	3	1.03	.382	--
Type of Empl. x Size	4.33	2	2.21	.116	--
Type of Empl. x Position	5.37	1	2.74	.101	--
Type of Business or Industry x Size	1.36	6	.69	.655	--
Type of Business or Industry x Position	3.33	3	1.70	.174	--
Size x Position	7.06	2	3.60	.031	6

Table 40

Means and Standard Deviations for Importance of Reading Broken Down by Type of Employer, Position of Respondent, and Size x Position

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Type of Employer		
Refugee	4.28	1.53
Non-refugee	4.86	1.52
Position		
Supervisor	4.73	1.48
Supervisor and Personnel Manager	4.30	1.62
Size x Position		
Small/Supervisor	4.56	1.50
Small/Supervisor and Personnel Manager	4.73	1.36
Medium/Supervisor	4.76	1.64
Medium/Supervisor and Personnel Manager	4.10	1.91
Large/Supervisor	4.83	1.25
Large/Supervisor and Personnel Manager	2.50	1.05

Table 41

Statistical Tests for Importance of Writing as a Function of Type of Employer, Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Employer	21.30	1	7.76	.007	7
Type of Business or Industry	1.41	3	.51	.674	--
Size of Business or Industry	.88	2	.32	.727	--
Position of Respondent	2.41	1	.87	.352	--
Type of Empl. x Type of Business or Industry	1.53	3	.56	.645	--
Type of Empl. x Size	7.84	2	2.85	.063	--
Type of Empl. x Position	1.63	1	.60	.443	--
Type of Business or Industry x Size	.58	6	.21	.973	--
Type of Business or Industry x Position	.49	3	.18	.912	--
Size x Position	7.82	2	2.85	.064	--

Table 42

Means and Standard Deviations for Importance of Writing Broken Down by Type of Employer

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Refugee	3.62	1.73
Non-refugee	4.61	1.63

Table 43

Statistical Tests for Importance of Speaking, Listening, Reading, and Writing Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future, and Overall Evaluation of Refugee Employees

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Speaking/Willingness	.18	.089	--
Speaking/Evaluation	.04	.372	--
Listening/Willingness	.39	.002	15
Listening/Evaluation	-.03	.414	--
Reading/Willingness	.14	.164	--
Reading/Evaluation	.33	.005	11
Writing/Willingness	.12	.194	--
Writing/Evaluation	.23	.042	5

form, they will also be presented in the Discussion section.

A concern of some service providers was the amount of interest by companies of having on-site language training classes. To obtain this information, employers were asked to indicate their interest in general English classes, job-related English classes, and their willingness to pay employees to participate in such classes. Responses can range from 1 (low interest or low willingness) to 7 (high interest or high willingness). As Table 44 shows, interest tends towards low and willingness is quite low.

Table 44

Means and Standard Deviations for Interest in General English Classes, Interest in Vocational English Classes, and Willingness to Pay Participants

	Mean	Standard Deviation
General English	3.51	2.28
Vocational English	3.75	2.25
Willingness to Pay	2.00	1.46

As Tables 45, 46, and 47 show, interest is not affected by either type or size of business or industry. Willingness to pay is greater with larger industries but is still low. (See Table 48.) As Table 49 indicates, none of these evaluations correlated with willingness to hire in the future. Overall evaluation correlates only with willingness to pay participants--a positive correlation.

Table 45

Statistical Tests for Interest in Vocational English Classes as a Function of Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Business or Industry	5.64	3	1.18	.323	--
Size of Business or Industry	11.34	2	2.37	.100	--
Type x Size	9.56	3	2.00	.121	--

Table 46

Statistical Tests for Interest in Vocational English Classes as a Function of Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry, and Position of Respondent

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Business or Industry	7.14	3	1.55	.207	--
Size of Business or Industry	11.71	2	2.54	.085	--
Type x Size	8.48	3	1.84	.146	--

Table 47

Statistical Tests for Willingness to Pay Participants as a Function of Type of Business or Industry, Size of Business or Industry

	Mean Square	DF	F	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
Type of Business or Industry	2.73	3	1.48	.230	--
Size of Business or Industry	7.20	2	3.90	.026	11
Type x Size	4.23	3	2.29	.089	--

Table 48

Means and Standard Deviations for Willingness to Pay Participants Broken Down by Size of Business or Industry

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Small	1.67	1.16
Medium	2.17	1.47
Large	2.83	1.59

Table 49

Statistical Tests for Interest in General English Classes, Interest in Vocational English Classes, and Willingness to Pay Participants Correlated with Willingness to Hire in the Future, and Overall Evaluation of Refugee Employees

	r	Probability	Variance Accounted for (%)
General English/ Willingness to Hire	-.03	.403	--
General English/ Evaluation	.17	.057	--
Vocational English/ Willingness to Hire	-.01	.480	--
Vocational English/ Evaluation	.12	.128	--
Willingness to Pay/ Willingness to Hire	.08	.264	--
Willingness to Pay/ Evaluation	.26	.018	7

Non-statistically Oriented Presentation of the Results

When employers were asked to evaluate refugee employees in terms of the degree to which they experienced various problems, they consistently reported that they did not experience the problems mentioned to any degree. The following is a list of the problems in order of the degree to which they were not experienced:

Being late for work
Inability to get along with supervisory personnel
Inability to get along with fellow workers
Being absent or late due to problems with child care

Unexcused absences
Depression or anxiety
Instability of employment
Quitting without notice, and
Problems getting transportation

The findings also indicate that employers experienced problems with employees in general much more than they did with refugee employees. The latter finding held true for the following problems:

Being late for work
Unexcused absences
Inability to get along with fellow workers
Inability to get along with supervisory personnel
Being absent or late due to problems with child care
Instability of employment
Quitting without notice, and
Depression or anxiety

The problems above are listed from the highest to lowest degree of difference between refugee employees and employees in general.

The results for employers' evaluations of worker characteristics were equally favorable for refugee employees. Refugee employees were consistently evaluated as quite high on all dimensions focused on in the study. They were also consistently rated as significantly higher than employees in general. The left-hand column below lists the worker characteristics in order of the strength of the rating. The right-hand column lists the worker characteristics in order of the degree of difference between employers' evaluation of refugees and employees in general. (Listed from highest to lowest.)

reliable	reliable
honest	industrious
cooperative	responsible
trustworthy	thorough
industrious	cooperative
responsible	honest
thorough	enthustiastic attitude
ambitious	trustworthy
enthusiastic attitude	ambitious

Another finding related to worker characteristics is that employers' evaluations of refugee employees were much more consistent from employer to another than were evaluations of employees in general. This pattern was evident for every worker characteristic.

Employers were asked to rate the importance of different types of information for evaluating refugee job applicants and job applicants in general. An examination of employers' ratings show that the information is less important for evaluating refugee employees than for employees in general. The difference in importance proved to be significant for five of the seven types of information considered. These five are listed in the right-hand column below in order of the degree of difference. The left-hand column lists the information types in order of their importance in evaluating refugee job applicants.

frequency of job changes	salary desired
ability to get along with people	educational background and training
reasons for leaving previous jobs	reasons for leaving previous jobs
related work experience	ability to get along with people
educational background and experience	other work experience
salary desired	
other work experience	

For importance of information, employers' evaluations of job applicants in general were more consistent from employer to employer than employers' evaluations of refugee job applicants. This trend held for every type of information considered.

Employers were also asked to evaluate the ease or difficulty of obtaining various types of information. Six of the seven types of information were evaluated as slightly difficult to obtain. One, salary desired, was evaluated as slightly easy to obtain. The order of ease of obtaining the various information types is provided below:

salary desired
related work experience
educational background and training
frequency of job changes
ability to get along with people
reasons for leaving previous jobs
other work experience

Refugee job applicants and job applicants in general were also compared in terms of how employers evaluated them in terms of their behavior in interviews. In order of degree of difference, refugees were evaluated more positively in terms of:

does not overemphasize money and benefits
polite
comes to the interview on time
grooming and clothing are appropriate

Employees in general were evaluated more positively in terms of:

application is filled out completely
maintains good eye contact

No significant differences were found for:

appears to be well-motivated
application is neatly filled out
appears to answer questions honestly

Employers' evaluations of refugee job applicants in terms of their behavior in an interview varied considerably from behavior to behavior. The range goes from quite positive to somewhat negative. The behaviors are listed below in order of how well refugees were evaluated. The list starts with tne most positive.

polite
comes to the interview on time
appears to answer questions honestly
does not overemphasize money and benefits
grooming and clothing are appropriate
appears to be well-motivated
application is filled out neatly
maintains good eye contact
application is filled out completely

A series of questions dealt with personnel managers' expectations with regard to the English language proficiency of job applicants. Seventy-one percent of the personnel managers indicated that they would not allow a job applicant to bring a translator to an interview and to answer questions through the translator. Their expectations with regard to oral skills can be characterized as job applicant must be able to answer all questions even though there are still errors in vocabulary choice and grammar. With regard to written skills as they relate to filling out an application, the expectation is that the job applicant must be able to fill out most of the application by themselves without using a translator.

Individuals with a line level supervisory function were asked to evaluate the importance of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. All were evaluated as at least somewhat important. The four skill areas are listed below in order of their importance.

listening
speaking
reading
writing

In order to determine the actual langauge proficiency of refugee employees being hired, a short written test was given to 65 employees. The test has a range of 0 to 25. The average score by refugee employees was 10.7. The meaning of this score will be discussed in the Discussion section.

The last area explored in the project was employer's interest in having English language classes at the company site. Although the interest in vocationally oriented English classes was slightly higher than in general English classes, interest is on the low side. The companies contacted were also not willing to pay participants to attend such classes.

As a follow-up to the questions answered above, the data was also analyzed to determine if responses varied according to the type of business or industry, the size of business or industry, or the position of the respondent (personnel manager and supervisor both, personnel manager only, supervisor only). In only one out of fifteen comparisons did size of business or industry have an impact. Larger industries were more willing to pay for language classes. Likewise, in only one of the fifteen comparisons did size of business or industry have an impact. Larger industries were more willing to pay for language classes. Likewise, in only one of the fifteen comparisons did position of respondent make a difference. Individuals who were both personnel manager and supervisor evaluated reading as being less important than did individuals who were supervisors only.

Another series of follow-up analyses focused on overall evaluation of refugees and willingness to hire in the future. The responses to these two items were compared with responses to the other questions asked in the study. The only significant relationships for overall evaluation were found with:

importance of reading
willingness to pay participants for English classes
importance of writing

These relationships were all positive. They are listed in order of the strength of the relationship. Willingness to hire in the future was, however, significantly and positively related to a number of other questions. In order of the strength of the correlations these items were:

importance of listening
reliability
low depression or anxiety
not having unexcused absences
not being absent or late due to problems with child care
not being late for work

low instability of employment
politeness
enthusiastic attitude
responsibleness
thoroughness
low inability to get along with fellow workers
cooperativeness
trustworthiness
overall ease of obtaining information in an interview
low inability to get along with supervisory personnel
employees not having problems getting transportation
grooming and clothing in an interview are appropriate
application is filled out neatly
not quitting without notice
honesty
industriousness
comes to the interview on time
does not overemphasize money or benefits

DISCUSSION

Quantitative Results in Light of the Qualitative Results

In this section the analyses of the questionnaire results (the quantitative results) will be compared to the responses given by personnel managers and supervisors in the face-to-face interviews (the qualitative results). At this point, the reader is strongly encouraged to examine Appendix D. The appendix provides a copy of the research interviewer's notes on the face-to-face interview. The notes are broken down by interview questions and by position of the respondent.

The research questions focus on the areas of problems with employees, culture, language skills in relationship to actual job performance, and language skills in relationship to the interview process. With regard to problems with employees, the responses to the questionnaire paint a glowing picture of refugees as employees. Question 1--barriers to employment, Question 3--problems in general, Question 4--problems because of cultural differences, Question 5--problems with other non-refugee workers, and Question 7--conflicts or problems with supervisory personnel of the face-to-face interview all address the problems with the employee's area. The responses to these questions support the questionnaire findings. Twenty-six respondents reported "no problems" with regard to problems in general, sixty-two with regard to problems because of cultural differences, sixty-five with regard to problems with non-refugee employees, and fifty-six with regard to problems or conflicts with supervisory personnel. Some problems were, however, reported.

As one might expect, language was a concern. Eighty-three respondents mentioned it as a major barrier to employment. With regard to problems in general and problems or conflicts with supervisory personnel, language was again the most frequent source of problems being mentioned by forty-one and twenty-one respondents, respectively.

Other problems centered around cultural differences. With regard to problems in general, fourteen respondents mentioned hygiene and use of toilet facilities as a problem. These were also mentioned six times as a problem because of cultural differences and eight times as a problem with other non-refugee workers. In many instances, respondents were quick to mention that these types of problems were quickly resolved and did not really cause any problems. Keep in mind also that the frequency of mention in comparison to total number of respondents (ninety-five) is fairly low.

The questionnaire addressed the are of culture by examining employers' reactions to refugee employees in terms of work-related characteristics. Their responses were quite favorable. Also, as with problem, refugee employees were evaluated more favorably than employees in general. Employers' responses to Question 2 of the face-to-face interview--what do you like/dislike about refugee employees--validate the findings of the quantitative analyses. Thirty-seven respondents characterized refugee employees as hard-working/industrious/productive, nineteen as dependable, twelve as punctual with low absenteeism, and eight as polite/pleasant. Only one response was negative. Question 15 asked for additional miscellaneous comments. The responses were closely aligned with the responses to Question 2. Most respondents did not have any comments to make, but of twenty-eight making evaluative comments, only one was negative.

As the responses to Question 6 indicate, non-refugee employees' reactions to their refugee co-workers were also favorable. Sixty-four responses were positive, ten neutral and ten negative. Refugee employees, likewise, appear to respond favorably to their work situations. Sixty-eight employers indicated that their refugee employees have a positive attitude toward the company, sixteen felt that the attitude was neutral, and only three felt the attitude to be negative.

Question 11--cultural differences related to the organization of work in this country and employer expectations--addresses the issue of culture more directly. Sixty-seven respondents reported that they had not noticed any areas in which culture seemed to be a factor. Five respondents mentioned benefits as an area of difference. As reported above, cultural differences were not a significant factor with regard to problems.

Tangentially related to the culture issues discussed above are the responses to the 14th question of the face-to-face interview--observed differences between the different ethnic/national groups that make up Indochina. Of the ninety-five respondents, thirty-nine had not observed any differences and twelve had had experience with only one group. Of the remaining respondents, several commented only on physical appearance. Others commented on the fact that the groups did not mix well or appeared not to like each other. A number of individuals made comments on worker characteristics but at the same time no pattern was evident. Comments often contradicted each other.

As one might expect, language proficiency was a major concern for employers as is evidenced by the responses to Question 1 of the face-to-face interview. Eighty-three of the ninety-five respondents mentioned

language as a major barrier to employment. The language and job performance area was explored via several other questions. Questions 9 and 10 focused on specific problems created by lack of language proficiency. In Question 9 employers were asked to give topics that are especially difficult to talk about with Indochinese employees. Frequently mentioned topics were benefits (thirty-two respondents), company policies (fifteen respondents), and technical matters (twelve respondents). When employers were asked to identify times when employees fail to communicate, the responses were quite varied. Twenty-three respondents could not identify any particular times. Eight indicated that their employees did in fact speak up. Of the remainder, twenty-one mentioned that their refugee employees did not indicate when they did not understand something. The other responses were quite varied.

The questionnaire asked employers to evaluate the importance of the four basic language skills. Listening was evaluated as most important, followed by speaking, reading, and writing. In order to follow-up on this information, Question 13 of the face-to-face interview asked supervisory personnel to define the tasks that involved the four basic skills. The reader is urged at this point to refer to Appendix D. Listening came into play in the areas of taking directions and following instructions while speaking was involved in asking questions and reporting problems. The responses related to reading and writing were more varied. Reading included reading numbers, blueprints, specifications, company notices, work orders, labels, and measurements. Writing included writing down numbers, filling out reports and completing time cards.

The results of the language proficiency test also bear on the issue

of language and job performance. However, several problems were encountered in the study which make the results somewhat suspect. First, of the eighty companies participating in the questionnaire and interview phases of the study, only thirty-eight would allow their employees to take the language proficiency test. The reasons for non-participation centered around disruption of work routine. This fact alone raises a serious question about the randomness of the sample. Also, as Table 50 indicates, the sex and ethnic/national profile of the sample does not match the profile of the refugee population of Utah in general. An additional concern is that in spite of the researcher's request to involve recent hires in the testing, the average length of time with the company for the sample was over ten months. These three factors make the meaning of the results less than clear.

With regard to language and the job interview process, the results of the questionnaire suggest that personnel managers who do not use the actual information in an interview evaluate refugee applicants as much as they do applicants in general. They appear to rely on the reputation of refugees in general. In part, this may be due to the fact that it is at least somewhat difficult to obtain information from job applicants. Another factor may be that, with regard to more global impressions formed in an interview, refugees do come off reasonably well, better in many cases than employees in general.

In spite of how employers actually use the information gained in an interview, their expectations with regard to refugees' performance in a job interview are fairly high. This is borne out both by the questionnaire results and by the responses given to Question 12--policies or requirements

Table 50

Sex and Ethnic/National Representation in the Sample and Population

	Number in Sample	Percentage in Sample	Percentage in Population*
Vietnamese	1	1.2	25
Ethnic Chinese	21	25.9	25
Lao	23	28.4	21.4
Hmong	25	30.9	21.4
Cambodian	8	9.9	7.2
Other	3	3.7	0.0
Male	27	33.3	65
Female	54	66.7	35

*Figures on the percentage in the refugee population in Utah were provided by the Department of Social Services, Refugee Unit.

Implications for Service Providers

The remarks here will be directed to four main groups of service providers: job development/placement personnel, instructors, orientation specialists, and program designers.

Job Development/Placement Personnel

The Indochinese refugees have done an excellent job of developing a good solid reputation among employers who are familiar with them. As mentioned previously, these same employers are apparently relying more on this reputation when evaluating refugee applicants than upon interview information

itself. Employers who have not had direct or indirect contact with refugees are more than likely a different situation. As one would expect and as the study validates, personnel managers have considerably more difficulty obtaining information from refugee applicants than from applicants in general. One solution is to raise the level of language proficiency--clearly a long-range solution. The other solution is to relay information about refugee employees' reputation to employers who have not had contact with them. In a modest way, this study provides an additional tool for the job developer --a validated reputation for the refugee applicants. A synopsis of the main findings of this study will be sent to each of the companies cooperating in the study as part of the dissemination process. If, in fact, it proves to be a useful tool, job development/placement personnel are welcome to use this study in any way possible.

Instructors

The bulk of the results relate to instructors of English as a second language but also bear on instructors involved with job seeking skills and vocational training.

The results indicated, as might be expected, that listening was rated as the most important skill followed by speaking, reading, and writing. The responses to Question 13 of the face-to-face interview provide an informal task analysis of each of these four skills. Clearly, some of the task skills fall out of the expertise of most ESL instructors. For example, under reading several supervisors mention reading blueprints. Given both the variety of blueprints possible and the expertise necessary to understand and talk about blueprints, the idea of including teaching blueprint reading in a general ESL program is not practical.

Nonetheless, the responses listed in the appendix do provide ideas for introducing vocationally related language tasks into an ESL program. Things such as blueprint reading, writing out work orders, etc., are also the type of tasks that vocational training institutions could profitably focus on.

The results from the questionnaire also suggest both what employers are preceiving as important in an interview and where refugee applicants are experiencing difficulty. Interviews tend to have a structure and format which is stable across interviews. Also, interviews are phenomena which the majority of refugees will likely experience. They are, therefore, a viable target area for most programs. Also, the results indicate employer expectations with regard to refugee applicants language performance in an interview are relatively high. This suggests that ESL and job seeking skills instructors have their work cut out for them.

> (NOTE: Crandall (1980) provides both an extensive discussion of vocationally oriented ESL instruction and extensive bibliographies of vocational ESL materials and vocational adult basic education materials which can be adapted for ESL classes. For more information about the Crandall monograph, please feel free to contact the author of this research report.)

Orientation Specialists

Emphasis has been given in the recent years to the orientation process that new refugees undergo when arriving in the U.S. As part of that orientation, refugees typically receive information about jobs in the U.S. and the cultural aspects surrounding obtaining and keeping a job. The results of this study certainly add to the information that they might receive in their orientation. The information from the study in some respects might carry more weight than other information since it was

obtained from actual employers in response to the recent job market situation and actual refugee employees. The questionnaire and interview schedule provides a list of information available from the study. The results provide both a realistic picture of employer expectations and what they perceive as problems and the consolation of knowing that refugees have established a solid reputation with employers in the Utah area.

Program Designers

If the study accomplishes one thing, it is to validate the priority of providing language training even for entry-level and semi-skilled jobs. Also, while employment related English is only one facet of the language repertoire needed for survival in the U.S., the study suggests that it is an important facet. Among other things the study also validates the Department of Health Education and Welfare's (now Health and Human Services) Program Design Considerations for English as a Second Language (1980) --specifically the section dealing with ESL/General Vocational Instruction (See Appendix E).

In 1981, the Utah State Office of Education issued its Adult Refugee Education and Training Criteria/Standards. The study also largely validates the priorities listed in that document.

Conclusion

The study focused on employers' reactions to Indochinese refugees as employees and as job applicants. The reactions were largely favorable with regard to refugee worker characteristics and problems typically encountered with employees. Refugee employees were perceived more favorably than employees in general. Problems related to language and to a

minor degree with cultural differences were, however, encountered.

With regard to the interview process, personnel managers appear to use the information obtained through interview questions less in their evaluation of refugee job applicants than in their evaluation of job applicants in general. The results suggest that this may be related both to the difficulty of obtaining information and to the fact that personnel managers rely more on the reputation of refugees as a group in making their evaluation. Despite these facts, however, employers have relatively high expectations about the level of language proficiency that a refugee job applicant should demonstrate for a successful interview. Employers expect applicants will be able to answer all questions even though there are still errors in vocabulary choice and grammar. Also, employers expect that job applicants will be able to fill out most of an application by themselves without using a translator.

With regard to language and actual job performance, the study determined that listening was the most important language skill followed by speaking, reading, and writing. The study also detailed the specific job related tasks for each of these four areas. The study also determined that the topics with which employers had the most difficulty communicating about were benefits and company policies.

The non-finding are also notable. Neither size nor type of business or industry affected employers' reactions. Also, the position of the respondent (personnel manager, supervisor, both) did not have any affect on the results.

Based upon the results, suggestions were made for job development/ placement personnel, instructors, orientation specialists, and program designers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bach, R. L., & Bach, J. B. Employment patterns of southeast Asian refugees. Monthly Labor Review, 1980, 103, 31-38.

Best, J., & Flyin, D. Structure tests--English language (STEL). Prowley, Mass.: Newbury House Pub., 1978.

Bowman, J. P., & Branchaw, B. P. Understanding and using communication in business. San Francisco, CA.: Canfield Press, 1977.

Committee for the First National Indochinese Manpower Development Conference. First national Indochinese manpower development resolutions. Chicago, IL.: Truman College, 1979.

Crandall, J. A. Adult vocational ESL. Arlington, VA.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1979.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Refugee Resettlement. Program design considerations for English as a second language. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1980.

Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Refugee Resettlement. Report to the Congress--refugee resettlement program. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1981.

Dresner, J., Beck, K., Carter, L., & Morgano, C. It's up to you: Language skills and strategies for getting a job. N.Y.: Longman, 1980.

Edwards, A. L. Edwards personal preference schedule. N.Y.: Psychological Corporation, 1959.

Finnan, C. R. Occupational assimilation of refugees. International Migration Review, 1981, 15, 292-309.

Gough, H. G. California psychological inventory. Palo Alto, CA.: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1957.

House of Congress, Refugee act of 1980. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980. (Indochinese refugee reports, 1980, 1, 23).

Information Exchange Project, American Public Welfare Association. Indochinese refugee reports. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1979-1981.

Jew, W., & Tong, R. Janus job interview kit. Hayward, CA.: Janus Book Publishers, 1976.

Perschau, D. Group job seeking course guide. Washington, D.C.: Office of Work Incentive Programs, 1980.

Salt Lake Area Chamber of Commerce. Employer list. Salt Lake City, UT: Author, 1980.

Stein, B. Occupational adjustment of refugees: The Vietnamese in the the United States. International Migration Review, 1979, 13, 25-45.

Stewart, C. J., & Cash, W. B. Interviewing principles and practices. Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown Co., 1978.

Utah Department of Employment Security. Directory of Utah manufacturers. Salt Lake City, UT: Author, 1980.

APPENDIX A

THE RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Utah Technical College is conducting a research project that explores employers' reactions to actual and prospective Indochinese employees. The research project is sponsored by the State Office of Labor and Training. The results will be used to make vocational training and job development programs more responsive to industries'/ businesses' needs. Your answers on this questionnaire will assist us in successfully completing the project.

All answers are strictly confidential. Please answer questions as completely as possible. Keep in mind that the study centers on employers' reactions to employees in entry level and semi-skilled positions.

Most of the questions follow a format similar to that used in this example:

Our company has a problem with employees dressing appropriately for work

does not have this problem _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ does have this problem

If you strongly agree or disagree with the statement, you would mark an "X" in either the extreme left or extreme right space. If your position is a middle or neutral one, you would mark an "X" in the middle space. The remaining spaces represent positions which are neither extreme nor neutral. If your position is neither extreme nor neutral, you would mark one of the remaining spaces.

example - extreme disagreement

does not have this problem __X__:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ does have this problem

example - slight agreement

does not have this problem _____:_____:_____:_____:__X__:_____:_____ does have this problem

example - neutral

does not have this problem _____:_____:_____:__X__:_____:_____:_____ does have this problem

example - disagreement, neither extreme nor slight

does not have this problem _____:__X__:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ does have this problem

It will take about 10-15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Employment interviewers gather information about prospective employees such as work experience, frequency of job changes, etc. On the following scales, please indicate the importance of the following information to you when evaluating prospective Indochinese employees:

Salary desired

Important _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unimportant

Educational background and training

Important _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unimportant

Reasons for leaving previous jobs

Important _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unimportant

Frequency of job changes

Important _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unimportant

Ability to get along with people

Important _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unimportant

Related work experience

Important _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unimportant

Other work experience

Important _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unimportant

On the following scales, please indicate the ease or difficulty of getting the following information from prospective Indochinese employees in an interview:

Other work experience

Difficult _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Easy

Ability to get along with people

Easy _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Difficult

Reasons for leaving previous jobs

Difficult _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Easy

Salary desired

Easy _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Difficult

Related work experience

Easy _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Difficult

Frequency of job changes

Difficult _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Easy

Educational background and training

Easy _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Difficult

Interviewers often form impressions about prospective employees based upon their behavior in the interview. On the basis of your experience, how would you characterize Indochinese interviewees in general?

Appears to be well motivated

Is _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Is not

Application is filled out completely

Is _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Is not

Overemphasizes money and benefits

Does _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Does not

Comes to the interview on time

Does _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Does not

Grooming and clothing are appropriate

Is _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Is not

Application is filled out neatly

Is _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Is not

Polite

Is _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Is not

Appears to answer questions honestly

Does _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Does not

Maintains good eye contact

Does _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Does not

Yes _____ No _____ Would you allow an Indochinese interviewee to bring a translator to an interview and to answer questions through the translator?

Which of these statements best describes your expectations about Indochinese interviewees' English language skills?

_____No English language skills are required as long as someone is available to translate.

_____They must be able to answer at least the basic questions concerning name, age and residence.

_____The must be able to answer questions relating to biographical data including work experience. They do not need to be able to answer more extended questions such as long range goals.

_____They must be able to answer all questions even though there are still errors in vocabulary choice and grammar.

_____They must be able to answer all questions and speak as well or nearly as well as someone born and raised in the U.S.

Which of these statements best describes your expectations about Indochinese interviewees' ability to fill out the application form?

_____A translator can fill out the application for the interviewee.

_____They must be able to fill out the application by themselves although they can use a translator to explain what is being requested on the application.

_____They must be able to fill out <u>most</u> of the application by themselves without using a translator.

_____They must be able to fill out the <u>entire</u> application by themselves without using a translator.

Employers report that they have problems with their employees being late, calling in sick excessively, etc. On the scales below, please indicate the degree to which you have or have not experienced the following problems with your Indochinese workers.

Inability to get along with fellow workers

Have experienced this problem _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Have not experienced this problem

Unexcused absences

Have experienced this problem _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Have not experienced this problem

Being late for work

Have experienced this problem _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Have not experienced this problem

Quitting without notice

Have experienced this problem _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Have not experienced this problem

Instability of employment
(Not staying with the employer)

Have experienced this problem _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Have not experienced this problem

Inability to get along with supervisory personnel

Have experienced this problem _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Have not experienced this problem

Employees having problem getting transportation to and from work

Have experienced this problem _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Have not experienced this problem

Being absent or late due to problems with child care

Have experienced this problem ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ Have not experienced this problem

Depression or anxiety

Have experienced this problem ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ Have not experienced this problem

Employees can be rated along dimensions such as trusting-untrusting, patient-impatient, etc. Please rate your Indochinese employees on the following dimensions:

Ambitious _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unambitious

Enthusiastic attitude _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Negative attitude

Responsible _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Immature

Thorough _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Haphazard

Cooperative _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Uncooperative

Reliable _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Unreliable

Honest _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Dishonest

Industrious _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Lazy

Trustworthy _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Untrustworthy

In general, did you find it easy or difficult to evaluate your Indochinese employees on the a bove scale?

Easy _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Difficult

Most jobs, no matter how unskilled, usually require some degree of communication skills. How important are the following communication skills to the unskilled and semi-skilled jobs in your place of work?

Speaking

Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Important

Listening

Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Important

Reading

Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Important

Writing

Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Important

Are you more or less likely to hire Indochinese employees now than you were in the past?

More _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Less

If you are more or less likely to hire Indochinese employees now than you were in the past, briefly describe the reason(s):

_____

_____

_____

In general, what is your evaluation of Indochinese employees?

Worse than the average employee _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Better than the average employee

If you think Indochinese employees are better or worse than you average employee, breifly describe the reason(s):

_____

_____

_____

Is your company willing/reluctant to hire Indochinese employees in the future?

Willing _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Reluctant

How interested would you be in having English language classes (free of cost) for your non-English speaking employees held at your place of work?

Very interested _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Not very interested

How interested would you be in having English language classes (again, free of cost) held at your place of work for your non-English speaking employees if these classes were oriented to the vocabulary, terminology and type of language used at your place of work?

Very interested _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Not very interested

Would you have a room available to hold such classes (10-15 people)?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Do not know

Would you be willing to pay your employees at their regular wage for the time (say 5 hours a week for 3 months) spent in an on-site English class?

Willing _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Not willing

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What barriers to employment, if any, do you perceive for the Indochinese?

2. Is there anything in particular about the Indochinese that you especially like?

3. What kinds of problems do you have with your Indochinese employees? What do you attribute these problems to? (What do you think causes these problems?)

4. Are there any cultural differences that cause problems for you? What are they? How do they cause problems?

5. Do your Indochinese employees have any behaviors or attitudes that your non-Indochinese employees dislike? What are they? Do these behaviors and attitudes cause any problems or conflicts? What kinds of problems or conflicts?

6. What, in general, would you say is the attitude of your non-Indochinese employees toward your Indochinese employees?

7. Are there any problems or conflicts that supervisory personnel have with Indochinese employees? Are these problems and conflicts that you have only with Indochinese employees or are they problems and conflicts that you have with all employees?

8. What, in general, would you say is your Indochinese employees' attitude toward the company?

9. With the language barrier, communication with Indochinese employees is sometimes a problem for employers and supervisory personnel. Are there any subjects, areas or things that are especially difficult to communicate about? Safety? Company rules?

10. Are there any times where your Indochinese fail to communicate that is, they don't communicate when they should? What are the times? What do you attribute their failing to communicate to? Shyness? Fear? Dislike of supervisory personnel? Culture?

11. Employers sometimes mention that the Indochinese do not seem to understand what working in the United States means. In other words, employers in the U.S. have different expectations than those in their native country. Likewise rules, and the organization of work may be different. Have you found anything in particular that the Indochinese do not seem to understand about work in this country?

12. Do you have any policies or requirements that especially affect the Indochinese? For example, citizenship or English language requirements?

13. Most jobs, even low level ones, require some communication skills. What I would like you to do is to think of the employees that you supervise.

    How is speaking involved in those jobs?

    ex. reporting work progress and problems encountered, relaying information, asking questions.

    How is listening involved?

    ex. taking orders, following instructions.

    How is reading involved?

    ex. assembly manuals, parts manuals, diagrams, schematics, numbers.

    How is writing involved?

    ex. making reports, filling out forms, checking things off on a list.

    What do the people you are thinking of basically do in their jobs?

    ex. operate machines, assemble parts, test equipment.

14. Throughout all of these questions, I've lumped all the Indochinese groups (Vietnamese, Laosian, Cambodian, etc.) together. Have you noticed any differences between these groups with regard to the questions I've been asking?

15. Is there anything about the Indochinese as workers that you would like to add?

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER FOR THE LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TEST

Utah Technical College is trying to find out why employers in Utah do or do not hire Indochinese refugees. One of the things that we are doing is testing the English language skills of foreign born people tnat have been hired. This will tell us how much English a person who has English as a second language has to know in order to get a job.

We would like you to take this short English language test. Your score on the test does not affect your job. We will not be telling your employer how you did on the test or how you answered the questions. You do not have to take the test. If you do take the test, however, it may help us to help other refugees get jobs.

Before you start the test we would like you to answer the following questions. You can answer them in your native language if you wish to.

1. Are you

   _____Vietnamese _____Chinese

   _____Lao _____Hmong

   _____Cambodian

2. Are you

   _____Male _____Female

3. How old are you? _____ years old

4. How long have you been in this country? _____years _____months

5. How long have you been working for this company?

   _____years _____months

6. What do you like about working in the U.S.?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

7. What do you dislike about working in the U.S.?

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. What are the differences between working in the U.S. and working in your country?

_____

_____

_____

_____

- -

Here is an example of one of the test questions.

A. He is a student.

B. He am a student.

C. He are a student.

A is correct. You would put an X through A to show that this is the best answer. Use only one X for each question.

- -

1. A. No, they not speak Spanish.
   B. No, they don't speak Spanish.
   C. No, they any speak Spanish.

2. A. Bill is twenty years old.
   B. Bill is twenty year.
   C. Bill is twenty year old.

3. A. When he is going there?
   B. When goes he there?
   C. When does he go there?

4. Are you the teacher?
   A. Yes, I do.
   B. Yes, I'm.
   C. Yes, I am.

5. Does that girl wash the dishes?
   A. Yes, she does.
   B. Yes, she washes.
   C. Yes, she is.

6. A. She never make a cake.
   B. She never do a cake.
   C. She never makes a cake.

7. A. Carol is youngest than Alice.
   B. Carol is the youngest.
   C. Carol is the youngest than Alice.

8. A. He needed to got pants.
   B. He needed to get pants.
   C. He needed to gets pants.

9. A. Where do eat the students?
   B. Where the students eating?
   C. Where will the students eat?

10. A. When would they like to eat?
    B. When they eat?
    C. When do they like eat?

11. He loved that girl. He asked her to marry him. She said, "Yes," but yesterday she married another man.
    A. He bought the ring because he got married.
    B. He bought the ring because marrying.
    C. He bought the ring because he was going to get married.

12. A. He is working with a friend of ours.
    B. He is working with a friend of our.
    C. He is working with a friend of us.

13. A. Was their sister coming to meet him?
    B. Was their sister comes to meet him?
    C. Was their sister came to meet him?

14. A. For four years, I was work with him.
    B. For four years, I was worked with him.
    C. For four years, I was working with him.

15. A. They have visiting there many times.
    B. They had visit there many times.
    C. They have visited there many times.

16. A. I am three years older than Kate.
    B. I am older than Kate three years.
    C. I am old than Kate tnree years.

17. A. The boy spent his money, didn't he?
    B. The boy spent his money, was he?
    C. The boy spent his money, wasn't he?

18. A. She measured that table.
    B. She has been measured that table.
    C. She was measured that table.

19. A. We don't know the people was he going to invite.
    B. We don't know the people he is going to invite.
    C. We don't know the people is he going to invite.

20. A. She washes dishes all the time.
    B. She all the time washes dishes.
    C. She washes all the time disnes.

21. A. She try to finish it before he return.
    B. She'll try to finish it before he return.
    C. She'll try to finish it before he returns.

22. A. I had tried to find my book.
    B. I had tried to found my book.
    C. I had tried found my book.

23. A. She will call you as soon as about the party.
    B. She will call you after about the party.
    C. She will call you about the party soon.

24. A. Before she picked him up, the baby has been crying.
    B. Before she picked him up, the baby had been crying.
    C. Before she picked him up, the baby had been cry.

25. A. George and Laura danced and talked all evening.
    B. George and Laura danced and talks all evening.
    C. George and Laura danced and talk all evening.

APPENDIX D

RESPONSES TO THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Question 1: What barriers to employment, if any, do you perceive for the Indochinese?

Personnel Managers

Language.
Language barrier--inability to communicate.
Language--hard to train.
Communication.
Speak English--must have communication in industrial manufacturing.
Need for interpreter--language--communication.
Communication--can the person be trained?
Only language--cannot easily communicate.
Following instructions--problems with placement. May not know how to find a job.
Language--type of product requires communication--unable to communicate.
No barriers.
Lack of specific work skills--most seem to come from non-industrial countries. Also language and communication are barriers.
Language.
Only communication.
Language and ability to culturally adapt.
Language--cannot communicate what needs to be done.
Language--they are also forced to work below their skill level.
Language--hard to teach new tasks.
None whatsoever.
Only language--give job with minimal communication.
Lack of job experience in U.S. and language.
Language--barrier to advancement.
If have background, no barrier. Language is a must.
Language.
Language--must be able to read specifications--cannot train.
Language--cannot communicate and train.
Language--need to understand for emergency reasons, hospital.
Language--and lack of specific skills--do not understand nature of work.
Language.
Lack of specific skills--most seem to come from non-industrial countries. Also language and communication.
Language and communication--hard to tell if they have proper skills.
Only language--hard to get a good job without it.
Language--all it takes is patience on the part of the employer.
Language--they are forced to work below their skill level.

Supervisors

Understanding language and culture.
Hard to communicate--they do not know the business.
Language--affects training program.
Language--fast learners--can be taught through example.
Language--use of interpreter.
Language is the only barrier and it can be overcome if employers are patient.

Language is only real barrier.
Communication, both with supervisor and guests--their size may limit them to non-heavy physical jobs.
None--language without interpreter.
Only one is being able to communicate.
Language--although the use of interpreter eliminates this.
None--language barrier can be overcome.
Language.
Ability to communicate--lack of job mobility.
Language.
Language--understanding job.
Language--restrictions on hours because of family commitments.
Language
Language--prevents advancement.
Language--cannot communicate job tasks--cannot ask questions.
Understanding language and culture.
Language--although the use of interpreter eliminates this.
The only barrier is being able to go about finding a job--because of the language.
None--language barrier can be overcome.
Ability to communicate--lack of job mobility.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

Language--communication.
None--if they can do the job, I will hire them.
Language--cannot understand instructions.
Language--cannot explain tasks.
Cannot get into their heads that semi-worn parts need to be replaced.
Language--in explaining the job to be done.
Language--many employers do not have the patience to overcome this barrier.
Language--high pressure job--cannot take time to show by example.
Communication.
None, except communication.
Language--and for us, the ability to sew.
Language--cannot explain tasks.
Cultural--sex role--men will not work with or be supervised by women.
Language--communication.
Language and prejudice--only language here.
Language--hard to train.
Language.
Language/communication problems. Ability to adjust to this culture.
Language--maintly U.S. government--in paying to go to school--leave this job when they are being trained.
Language--cultural differences (work, ethics--loyalty).
Language.
Language--cannot communicate job tasks. Cannot communicate with guests.
Communication--need new tasks told each day.
Language--problem because of custom type work.
Language--need to understand technical terms.
Language--need to find if they have appropriate skill and to train.

Language and communication problems. Hard to instruct them with new tasks.
Language--high pressure job--cannot take time to show everything by example.
None--except communication.
Communication--actually it is more of a barrier to advancement.
Language--problems because the work is different everyday.
Language--cannot understand instructions.
Language--have to show everything.
Language--expectations are too high--they expect too much--cannot explain tasks.
Need for interpreter--language--communication.

Question 2: Is there anything in particular about the Indochinese that you especially like or dislike? What?

Personnel Managers

Steady, loyal, hardworking, less turnover.
Neat, clean, hardworking, honest, pleasant.
Very polite, hardworking, ambitious.
Very dependable--stay busy.
Quiet--no hassles--cooperative.
Cleanliness, promptness, dependability, quick to learn.
Reliable and dependable--concentrate on work
Pretty good workers--more dedicated to job than non-Indochinese workers--do not goof off.
Hardworking, dependable.
Hardworking group. Give 110%. Love overtime.
Hardworking, learn quickly, have integrity. Keep working.
Always on time--minimal absenteeism. Very dependable.
Very dependable, do all kinds of jobs without hassles.
I have only interviewed them--never worked with them. They seem very polite.
Nothing in particular.
Good workers--always on time.
They are very industrious.
Productive, intelligent.
Generally do a pretty good job, above average.
Can work on own--work hard and consistently with menial, repetitive jobs.
Good attendance, punctual, very concerned about keeping jobs.
Neutral.
No difference at all.
Clean--well mannered, want to be educated, want to work--patient.
High productivity. Commitment to work.
Very dependable--good workers.
Very pleasant people in general.
Respect authority, mostly just like everybody else.
Steady, loyal, hardworking.
Always on time--minimal absenteeism. Very dependable.
Very loyal, hardworking and quiet.

Very dependable--do all kinds of jobs without hassles. Do not complain.
Very work-oriented--almost too eager to please.
Very industrious, hardworking.

Supervisors

Learn quickly.
No.
Dependable--good attendance.
Consistent workers, persistent, hardworking.
Very industrious--quick learning.
Very hard working--conscientious. Seem to take pride in their work.
No--they are no different than anyone else--I cannot generalize.
Hardworking and reliable.
Produce well--3/4 do outstanding jobs. Very dependable and love overtime.
Work habits--keeping busy--hardworking.
Hardworking--fast learning.
They concentrate on work rather than socializing.
Generally reliable, on time, fewer discipline times.
Very polite, dependable, punctual, clean.
Accurate, hardworking, punctual.
Good workers, follow through, concentrate on work.
Do not see any difference.
Very particular, fast learning, perfectionistic, conscientious.
Steady, never late, absent. Stays busy.
Quick leaners--take pride in work.
Learn very quickly.
Hardworking, fast learners.
Very hardworking--will do extra work--trying to please.
They concentrate on work rather than socializing.
Very polite, punctual, clean.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

Loyal, hardworking, quiet.
Hardworking, on time, obedient, fast learner.
Girls very polite--very industrious--instantly to work. Cannot say the same for men.
Good workers, dependable.
None.
Always want to work--eager to work--does not want to take a lunch. Will do anything.
Industrious, work steady.
Pleasant attitude--almost too pleasant, too agreeable--very disciplined workwise. Willingness to do whatever asked--no complaining.
Do whatever told--hard workers. Never complain.
Hardworking, punctual.
Hardworking--does what is asked--keeps busy.
She is very hardworking and dependable.
Good workers for the most part. Hardworking.

Damn hardworking people--I have never seen anyone work as hard. Will do anything asked.
Dependable--good worker--does what is told.
No different than others--dependable--reliable.
Very dependable, work rather than talk.
Training and then quitting without notice.
Just like any other--some are industrious, some are not. More ambitious.
Polite--nothing else in particular.
Very prompt, dependable, low absenteeism.
Good workers, keep busy, consistent, quality minded--obsessive.
None that I can be specific about.
Once they understand, quality of product is better than other workers.
Good workers, punctual, determined, clean.
Hardworking--would not stop until you told them to. Quick learning.
Very punctual, dependable, industrious, bored when not busy.
He was really ambitious and industrious.
Do whatever told--very hardworking.
Hardworking, does what is asked, keeps busy.
Works really hard, always on time, very polite.
Good workers, punctual, very determined.
Good worker, dependable.
Dependable--good worker, does what is told.
For the most part, are good workers.
Very clean, prompt, dependable, quick learning.

Question 3: What kinds of problems do you have with your Indochinese employees? What do you attribute these problems to? (What do you think causes these problems?)

Personnel Managers

Explaining benefits, insurance, profit sharing, culture-working differences, language.
None--except language.
Some turnover problems--3 to 4 months work until language is better, then leave.
None that I am aware of.
None.
None.
Training period is about 4 times longer. Must train by demonstration.
Other than language, none.
Clannish--when one quits, others may also. Caused by insecurity.
Language.
No particular problem.
Use of toilet facilities--proper use of toilet. Hygiene / spitting / cultural differences / quickly learned.
Communication--protective clothing.
They did not stay around long. Often quit after 2-3 weeks without notice.
A group of 4-5 will quit all at once with very little notice / variety of reasons--group loyalty, weather, finding of relatives.

They say "yes" to everything--even if they do not know what you are talking about.
Language and communication.
Language--misunderstanding, understanding, laws, insurance.
Just get them trained and then they seem to leave.
Communication only.
Head lice, fear of tuberculosis.
Only language.
None.
No disciplinary, no production problems.
Only language.
Weird toilet habits--standing on toilets, spitting on floor.
None, to speak of.
Isolated problems--hygiene, smell bad. Cultural differences. Some are not regular.
Explaining benefits, insurance / cultural differences / language.
Use of toilet facilities--proper use of toilet / spitting--cultural differences (quickly learned).
Just with communication.
Only communication.
Some habits such as spitting in the waste basket--cultural habit.
Only communication.

Supervisors

Attendance problem--some transportation problem, difficulty understanding bus routes / culture--language.
They want too much money and they do not know sewing / expectations of U.S. too high.
Difficulty in training--seldom flush toilet, spitting on floor until somewhat acculturated.
None.
None.
Some problems with spitting on floor / difference in cultural values.
Language only problem--some training problems--must start out at menial and repetitive jobs.
They seem to stick by themselves--cause no real problems except some alienation.
Grooming--spitting all over the place. Hygiene.
Communication--hard-headed. Hard to convince to do some jobs the accepted way.
Some bathroom / hygiene problems. Caused no conflicts / cultural differences.
Language--takes more time to explain tasks and train.
Communication--takes longer and is harder to train.
None.
Communication only.
Because of language (communication), gets confused about doing variety of things.
Just communication.
Nothing in particular.
None--communication.

Communication.
Some attendance problems, some transportation problems.
Some bathroom / hygiene problems. Probable cultural difference.
Only communication.
Because of the language, takes more time to explain new tasks.
None.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

Communication.
A little bit with communication.
Men are lazy--slow workers, little initiative--too much preoccupation with getting driver's license and car.
None--except language.
Lifting stuff--not working the fixed schedule--not as dependable--language and cultural--knowledge of life--choose hard ways of doing things. Not inventive--creative--lack common sense--driver's license, car more important than work.
Not getting paid for not coming in. Did not like not getting paid.
Had to let go--no productivity.
Some habits--spitting in waste basket--causes some complaints from other employees--cultural habit.
Language--cannot understand tasks.
Some quit to go to school.
None.
None.
Communication--understand company rules.
Customers resented being served by Indochinese.
Nothing.
None.
Have experienced none, other than communication.
Training and then quitting without notice.
Some dependability, tardiness problems.
Mainly language--say "yes" to understand when do not in order to please.
They felt they were treated unfairly in terms of shifts--because of communication problems.
Communication.
Seem to have a negative attitude--and expect special treatment.
None in particular.
None.
Other than language, none.
Communication--clannish, stayed within group.
Some dependability and tardiness problems, but not often.
Language--cannot understand new tasks.
None.
Only communication.
None.
None, except language.
Nothing.
Communication.
None.

Question 4: Are there any cultural differences that cause problems for you? What are they? How do they cause problems?

Personnel Managers

None
None
No
None that I am aware of.
No.
None.
None.
Not that I am aware of.
None.
Spitting in garbage cans, sink, restroom habits--because of food, breath is strong.
No.
See #3. Caused no conflicts. [#3 Use of toilet facilities--proper use of toilet. Hygiene (spitting), cultural differences / quickly learned.]
None.
None.
None.
They sometimes smell funny, because of the food they eat--has caused no problems.
They have a high regard for "personal honor," seem oversensitive--have quit over "nothing."
None.
None.
No, more with Indians / Mexicans.
Some would not work for a woman.
Not at work.
Not to my knowledge.
Picking nose--only initially.
None.
Not that I am aware of.
No.
Difference in holidays--want 2 weeks off for new year--no conflicts.
None.
Same as #3. No conflicts. [#3 Use of toilet facilities--proper use of toilet / spitting--cultural differences (quickly learned).]
None.
None.
No.
They are very sensitive--have quit over "hurt feelings."

Supervisors

Expect more than should in way of help.
No.
Nothing.
No.

None.
See #3--other employees do not like it. Think it's kind of disgusting. [#3 Some problems with spitting on floor / differences in cultural values.]
None.
None.
None.
Noticeable cultural difference but none that have caused problems.
See #3. [#3 Some bathroom / hygiene problems--caused no conflicts / cultural differences.]
None.
Food--some complaints about cooking odors--some resentment that they are being treated better.
They sometimes threaten to quit over minor issues.
Would not take a time cleaning lunchroom--felt it was demeaning.
None.
Family and clan responsibilities limit working time.
Fear of some habits, cliquishness.
None.
Food and eating habits are strong.
They expect more than they should in way of help.
Spitting also. Probably cultural difference.
None.
None.
They sometimes threaten to quit over minor issues.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

None.
None.
Explaining holidays and days off.
None.
No mechanical.
No.
We have not had any.
No.
No.
No.
None.
None.
Some complaints that their food stinks--no real conflicts--need to understand job longevity.
Chauvanism--women do not like the Indochinese attitude toward women. Do not like to be touched.
Nothing.
No--seemed to adapt real well--was somewhat isolated--no problems.
None.
None--have provoked arguments.
Not detected.
None.
Could not socialize with other employees at breaks--because bored and alienated from other employees.

None at all--some smell of food.
Cannot work on weekends because of religion.
No different than other employees. We overcome.
None.
None.
No.
None that I have detected.
No.
None.
None.
None.
None.
Nothing.
Some complaints that their food stinks--caused no conflicts. Do not stay very long.
None.

Question 5: Do your Indochinese employees have any behaviors or attitudes that your non-Indochinese employees dislike? What are they? Do these behaviors and attitudes cause any problems or conflicts? What kinds of problems or conflicts?

Personnel Managers

None.
Not to my knowledge.
They seem to have a strange and distinct odor, possibly caused by food (diet).
No.
None.
None.
Not that I am aware of.
Not that I am aware of.
Spitting in garbage cans, sink, restroom habits--because of food breath is strong.
Not that I know of.
See #3. Caused no conflicts. [#3 Use of toilet facilities--proper use of toilet. Hygiene / spitting / cultural differences / quickly learned.]
None.
Some resentment about their taking away jobs from Americans.
None.
None.
Not that I know of.
They work too hard--sometimes feel threatened.
Not that I know of.
No.
Stay in group--alienated.
Have not heard.
None.
Some resentment--do not know why.
None that I know of. None mentioned.

Not to my knowledge.
No.
None.
None.
Same as #3--no conflicts. [#3 Use of toilet facilities--proper use of toilet / spitting / cultural differences (quickly learned).]
None.
None.
See #3--no conflicts--just complaints. [#3 Some habits such as spitting in the waste basket--cultural habit.]
Not that I know of.

Supervisors

Over-defensiveness, over-sensitive, quick temper. No major conflicts.
No difference--variety of cultures here: Greek, Italian, Mexican, Indo-chinese.
See #3. No major conflicts. [#3 They want too much money and they do not know sewing / expectations of U.S. too high.]
No.
Not that we are aware of.
See #3--causes no conflicts--mostly resolved. [#3 Some problems with spitting on floor / difference in cultural values.]
Some resentment because of their tax advantage, apparently they have a period of income tax exemption. Some resentment with lay-offs--some Whites layed off first--has caused no overt conflicts.
None.
None.
Willing to work harder than regular workers / appreciation of a job.
See #3. [#3 Some bathroom / hygiene problems. Caused no conflicts / cultural differences.]
None.
None.
No.
None.
None.
None.
No complaints.
Some overuse of kitchen, microwave hogging--overpreparation.
Over-defensive, over-sensitive, quick temper. Has caused no major conflicts.
Spitting also. Probably cultural difference.
None.
None.
No.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

None.
None.
No.
None.

Very clannish / eating habits (raw meat)--smell worse--do not mix.
None.
Not that I know of.
See #3. [Some habits--spitting in waste basket--causes some complaints from other employees--cultural habit.]
At break they sit by selves.
No.
None.
No.
Clannish--others feel they are being snobbish. They feel like some lean on crutch of not speaking English. "I do not understand."
At first bad--nobody had the time or patience to help--since it has been better.
Not that I am aware of.
Not that I know of--got no negative feedback.
Not that I am aware of.
Do not mix real well. Language is reason.
Not detected.
Tend to use others' tools. Not inclined to buy tools to work with--do not know why.
None that I am aware of.
None.
They did not like the idea that the Indochinese wanted special treatment.
None, other than personality conflicts.
None.
Not to my knowledge.
None.
None that I have detected.
Tend to stick to selves at breaks--kind of cliquish--seem aloof.
None.
None that I know of.
None.
None.
Not that I am aware of.
Some felt that they are being cliquish and that they use lack of language as a crutch.
None.

Question 6: What, in general, would you say is the attitude of your non-Indochinese employees toward your Indochinese employees?

Personnel Managers

Favorable--employees come from variety of cultures.
Good--accepting.
Neutral--accepting.
Good.
Good--no objections.
Very tolerant--passive--do not go out of way to be friendly.
Very positive--enjoy getting to know them.
It seems to be really good--they are fairly helpful with tasks.

Very good--they are very accepting and helpful.
Really good acceptance--no hard feelings.
Seem to be accepting.
Generally indifferent--show respect.
Veterans do not like them. No conflicts, complaints to Personnel Manager. Attitudes change over time.
Some resentment that more time and attention is given to Indochinese employees.
Some complaints that they are taking jobs away from Americans--no conflicts.
They seem to like them. Okay.
Very accepting--no complaints.
Overall good--some isolated resentments (not cooperative).
Generally helpful, no complaints.
Well accepting--no complaints and no conflicts.
Most accept.
Because of lack of communication, tends to be isolated and alienated.
Cannot say.
General resentment that they are making too hard.
Neutral.
Do not know.
They go out of their way to be good to them and help them.
Fairly mixed--no problem but there are some prejudices--who knows why.
Seems favorable, employees come from a variety of cultures.
Same as #3--no conflicts. [#3 Use of toilet facilities--proper use of toilet / spitting--cultural differences (quickly learned).]
Accepted fairly good as far as I can tell.
We have some Viet Nam veterans who seem somewhat resentful--but mostly no problems.
Good--accepting--they like them because they are quiet and do not disturb.
Very accepting--no complaints.

Supervisors

Good--positive.
Positive.
Good--positive--accepting--try to converse.
Neutral--as far as I know--nothing explicit.
Very positive--accepting.
Very accepting.
See #5. [#5 Some resentment because of their tax advantage, apparently they have period of income tax exemption. Some resentment with layoffs--some Whites.]
They are very accepting and helpful.
Very good--well liked and accepted. Good attitudes.
Some feel like they are taking over jobs that "Americans" should have. Caused by selfishness.
Some resentment / taking jobs from Americans. About one-half feel this way. The other half is extra accepting and helpful.
Fine, accepting.
Some resentment towards their clannishness. Factor of language.

They treat them no different--hard to get friendly because of communication.
Really helpful, kind.
Frustration because of communication.
No problems--seem to mix well.
Helpful.
Some resentment over idea that they get extra money and benefits.
Seems to be pretty good--no conflicts.
Some resentment that they are taking jobs from Americans. Most are very accepting.
They seem to be accepted fairly well.
Fine--accepting.
Treated no different--hard to get friendly because of communication.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

Accepted fairly good.
Positive, accepting.
They like them--at first they were a little jealous.
Good--accepting, positive.
Do not like them--hostile.
Good, very good, accepting.
Neutral--equal--willing to work with them--teach them.
Good--accepting--they like them because they are quiet and do not disturb--piecework, like to concentrate on work.
Fine--accepting.
Seem to like them--friendly, accepting of the handicapped.
Very positive--they get along real well.
They have kind of adopted her. They really like her a lot and help her out.
Generally, pretty good--no real problems. Some resentment that they are taking jobs from Americans.
See #5. [#5 At first bad--nobody had the time or patience to help--since it has been better.]
Very willing to help and very accepting. Same as towards any new employee.
Positive--work force was primarily women. They took him under their wing.
Fine and accepting.
Favorable--one or two do not like them.
Acceptance--no real racist attitude.
Good--accepting.
Very good, accepting.
Favorable, accepting--ping pong playing during breaks.
Fairly good except for #5. [#5 They did not like the idea that the Indochinese wanted special treatment.]
They do not like them--fear being replaced.
Good and accepting--not much camaraderie because of language--have a variety of employees, Indians, Mexicans, Blacks.
They like them.
Some prejudice at first (jokes)--no conflicts.
Accepted like anyone else.

Fine--accepting.
Very positive--get along very well.
Seem to be very accepting and try to be friendly.
Seemed to be good although hard to make friends because of language limits.
Good, accepting, positive.
Very willing to help and very accepting--same as any new employee.
Some resentment that they are taking jobs from Americans--but mostly good.
Very tolerant, positive, do not go out of their way to be friendly.

Question 7: Are there any problems or conflicts that supervisory personnel have with Indochinese employees? Are these problems and conflicts that you have only with Indochinese employees or are they problems and conflicts that you have with all employees?

Personnel Managers

None--language penetration. Some hide behind language barrier.
None.
No conflicts.
Good.
None.
No.
None.
None.
Just communication--causes no conflicts.
Language--communication.
Communication but no conflicts.
Only communication--use of interpreter.
None.
None.
No.
Just communication.
None.
Just communication.
Not aware of any.
Only language.
See above. [Most accept.]
Only communication.
None.
No.
None.
Do not know.
None--always get along extremely well.
None.
I think some hide behind language barrier to avoid some work.
Only communication--we use interpreter.
Some problems with attendance / with all employees.
None.
Some of the more educatd ones are somewhat arrogant.
None.

Supervisors

None.
Ask for too much money--Indochinese more, but all employees.
None.
No.
Independence sometimes causes frustration.
None.
Communication.
Some have the general feeling that the work is too tough. Seem embarrassed about doing low level jobs.
See #3. [Grooming--spitting all over the place. Hygiene.]
See above.
None.
None.
None--willing to do anything.
None.
Communication--work tasks.
No.
None.
No.
No.
None.
No.
Nothing.
None.
None.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

Some problems with attendance.
Good attitude, eager to work.
Communication--union problems.
None.
Conflicts only / Indochinese.
No.
No--other than language.
Some more educated ones are somewhat arrogant.
Just language--cannot understand schedule.
No.
None.
None.
No. See above.
If they feel--may tune out--physically or mentally.
Slightly stubborn / no conflicts.
None.
None.
Just language.
Communication.
None--one was extremely anxious.
Language and special treatment--only Indochinese.
None specific.

None.
None.
None.
No.
Just language--some difficulty understandiong work schedule.
None
None.
None.
None.
Slightly stubborn / no conflicts / not only Indochinese.
No.
No.

Question 8: What in general, would you say is your Indochinese employees' attitude toward the company?

Personnel Managers

Favorable--positive.
Appreciative--have been given opportunity to work while acquiring language skills.
Good--positive.
Good.
Very good--no complaints.
They like it--very loyal.
Seem to be very happy and very pleased.
Good--have caused no problems.
Very good.
They love it--excellent benefits, insurance. We make the effort to treat them well.
Good, but some feel that they do not get paid as much as non-Indochinese.
Seems to be good--no complaints.
Really like to work here. Good to work for a big company.
Just a job, indifferent.
Good, since they are fairly reliable.
Hard to tell because they do not ever say anything about their feelings.
They do not really relate that--neutral.
They love it--a lot always trying to get in.
Seemed "okay."
Pretty good as far as I can tell.
Do not know.
Apparently positive--responded to lay-off recall.
Really try.
Grateful for the jobs. Do not make more.
Very favorable--more pay--grateful for opportunity.
Glad to get the job--few quitting.
They love working for me--I have the happiest crew in the hospital (housekeeping).
Appears to be good--towards management.
Seems to be positive.
Seems to be good--no complaints.
Neutral--not negative.

They really like working here, I assume.
Very good.
They do not relate that kind of information to me.

Supervisors

Good.
Good.
In general good. Sometimes hard to motivate to increase production--are satisfied with less.
Good attitude--respect Americans. Proud to be here and to have jobs.
Excellent attitude.
Neutral.
Varies from person to person--good to bad.
Generally good, but see #7. [#7 Some have the general feeling that the work is too tough. Seem embarrassed about doing low level jobs.]
Very good--cooperative--agree with everything.
Appreciate what they get.
Indifferent--a place to work.
Appreciation for giving them a job.
Seems really good. Higher loyalty than average worker.
Good, except for a few.
Always been good--never had any trouble.
Doubts about being treated fair, because of communication / no specific conflicts.
Good--no complaints.
Good.
Indifferent--a place to work.
I think they are happy to have a job.
Appreciation for giving them a job.
Fairly good.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

Neutral--not negative.
Good attitude, eager to work.
Good.
No attitude--neutral--only place for money.
Quite loyal--I do not think he could be hired away from me.
Good--because they stay with us.
Good.
Just a place to work--get money.
Like it--no problems or complaints.
Okay--pretty neutral--it is a place to work.
Very good, very loyal, very appreciative.
Indifferent--just a job until something better comes along.
Excellent, very loyal.
Very good--said he liked working here.
Frustrated--job was repetitive and monotonous.
Fine--no complaints.
Just a place to work--indifferent.
Base for future reference--for better jobs.

Just a place to work.
Just a place to work--conception of quality is different--could not get personally involved.
They do not say--but seem very loyal. None have quit. Never complain.
Some resentment over working hours.
They seemed to enjoy working for me.
From my observation--seemed content--no complaint.
Very favorable--no complaints--interested in work.
Pretty good--as a group they felt exploited because upward mobility. Went elsewhere--language.
Very glad to have a job.
Just a place to work--to get money.
Okay--neutral--just a place to work for the time being.
I think it is just a place to work right now--grateful to have any job.
Seemed content as far as I could tell.
Good.
Very good--indicated he liked working here.
Indifferent--just a job.
Very loyal--seemed to like it.

Question 9: With the langauge barrier, communication with Indochinese employees is sometimes a problem for employers and supervisory personnel. Are there any subjects, areas or things that are especially difficult to communicate about? Safety? Company rules?

Personnel Managers

New benefits plans.
Questions about paycheck, working hours, insurance benefits.
Training aspect--operation of machines.
Company policy--fringe benefits (interpreter).
Job tasks--task misunderstanding, benefits.
Use of interpreter--for all abstract things.
Insurance benefits, technical terms associated with work.
Not that I am aware of.
Have used interpreters to explain insurance benefits, vacations, policies, etc.
All company benefits, policies are written up in native language--no other problems.
How to go about getting what they want. Example, when want a raise, are not diplomatic about it--factor of language inefficiency.
Insurance benefits, company policy--have used interpreters.
Personal safety, training (if language is bad--menial jobs).
Since I have not trained them, I do not know.
Insurance, company benefits. We use interpreter.
Everything is different to communicate about.
Insurances, benefits / use of interpreter.
Taxes, insurance.
Use interpreter periodically to air problems--nothing specific except for company policy and insurance.
Company benefits, insurance, job training--management, technical terms.

Records, names, insurance, company policy. Use of interpreter initially.
Anything that is technical--send notes home--use of interpreter.
Cannot follow assembly procedures. Technical terms--business terms. Benefits.
Credit unions, loans, policies, checks.
Technical language, insurance, everything.
How to do work--insurance, company policy--use of interpreter.
Hardest was in understanding the senses--we encourgae English use. Nurses need to instruct them.
Everything!
See #3. [#3 Explaining benefits, insurance (cultural difference), language.]
Insurance, company policy. Have used interpreter.
All things that are abstract--that do not have physical models to use as examples--insurance, company policy.
Personal safety, training--mostly have to do menial jobs.
Nothing in particular.
Insurance, benefits--have used interpreter.

Supervisors

Work tasks, dress standards.
Yes, sewing.
Some aspects of training, health insurance, company policy.
Machinery terms--and tasks.
At beginning--insurance--piece rate--company benefits.
Days off (holidays)--sometimes they show up anyway.
Company policy, days off--some do not understand that overtime hours are occasionally necessary.
No.
Not that I have noticed.
Technical terms associated with job.
Company policy--rules--paid holidays.
Some problems with daily job tasks.
Explaining plant procedures--need interpreter.
Things that cannot be physically demonstrated.
Insurance, company policy--use of interpreter. Specs of each job.
Nothing specific.
No.
Use of slang terms.
Everything is very difficult.
Insurance, company benefits, policy, seniority system. Computerized.
Work tasks.
Company policy, rules, paid holidays and vacations.
Hard to understand new tasks.
Some communication with daily job tasks.
Anything that cannot be physically demonstrated.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

Company policy, insurance, benefits.
None now--at first, time clock, cards.

Holidays.
Cannot get personal information--prevents getting to know.
All areas.
Says, "Ya, ya," even if he does not know what you are talking about, consequently something does not get done that should.
Fringe benefits, insurance, retirement plan.
Piecework system--if they could understand it better, they would probably work faster.
Nothing in particular.
Some company policies and procedures, time off, bonus policies, insurance.
Nothing in particular.
Nothing in particular.
Piece work concept.
Help them understand the prejudice--working with the women--gets paranoid.
Nothing in particular.
Used an interpreter--any questions--he would bring in a note.
Training, policies, fringe benefits--use of interpreter.
No, not really--show by example. Forced them to understand insurance benefits. Learned well.
No--insurance, company policy.
Nothing in particular--they need to speak more English.
Do not know.
Insurances, company benefits--raises.
Everything--the whole general procedure.
Anything except very basic things.
Nothing in particular--task related terms, also they are used to metric.
Understanding their responsibilities.
Learning new skills--insurance benefits--bring in interpreter.
When something (anything) new is explained.
Nothing specific.
Nothing in particular.
Nothing in particular.
Not used to the English measuring system.
Cannot get personal information--hard to ge to know them.
Nothing in particular.
No.
Most things are quite difficult.

Question 10: Are there any times where your Indochinese fail to communicate, that is, they don't communicate when they should? What are the times? What do you attribute their failing to communicate to? Shyness? Fear? Dislike of supervisory personnel? Culture?

Personnel Managers

Sick and cannot come in--fail to notify / cultural--linqual--no telephone.
Not to my knowledge
Task problems--not asking for help.

Yes. But no specifics.
Afraid to speak up for fear of not understanding questions.
Do not indicate when they do not understand something. Agree to everything. Embarrassment.
No. If they do not understand they usually find some way to ask questions.
Not that I know of.
Generally quiet--usually say "yes" to everything. We use interprter extensively.
I am sure but I do not know specific / fear--little people--humble.
Yes. Nothing in particular--common for all new employees / shyness.
Do not call in sick. Come in after with interpreter.
They are quiet most of the time.
None.
All the time, when they do not understand something, they say they do (nod head).
Not that I know of.
Yes. But do not know / interpreter.
Did not call in when sick, etc. Did not have phone--cultural, language.
Not that I am aware of. Does not show any emotion.
Not sure.
Communication barrier is so profound I do not ever know what he is feeling.
If a problem comes up they will usually make it known.
Cannot put Indochinese in supervisory positions--they rebel. Would not tell people what to do.
If they feel they are being underpaid or unequity.
If they do not uderstand they say "yes." Do not want you to think they are dumb.
No.
No. They do speak up.
If sick and cannot come in, they fail to notify / maybe do not have phone.
Yes. Nothing in particular / shyness.
None noted.
Do not call in sick--they come in afterwards with an interpreter.
Agree falsely before they understand instructions.
Not that I know of.

Supervisors

No.
No.
Fail to ask questions about tasks, progress / culture.
Do not say when inventory parts are low.
No.
When they do not understand something. They usually go to someone who can interpret.
No.
When they are uncomfortable physically they do not speak up.
Do not speak up about problems with job and people.
No.

Sometimes, when they do not understand something / embarrassment--shyness.
When given specific instructions and they do not understand, they indicate that they do.
None.
Quiet most of the time anyway--nothing specific.
Not come forth with ideas and complaints unless prodded.
No--seem straightforward.
If a problem, they will use interpreter to get it solved.
Will make problems known with notes or extended effort.
When problems come up.
No.
Sometimes when they do not understand / probably from being self-conscious.
Hard to communicate personal problems that affect work--such as when they are sick--do not say anything.
They nod "yes" when they do not understand. Probably because they do not want to appear dumb.
Quiet most of the time.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

None noticed.
Not that I know of--if don't understand I can tell by expression.
Not that I know of. Heard no complaint.
None.
Not that I know of--very quiet.
Hardly ever comes to supervisor for anything. Try to do things on own when should ask.
New assignments--question--but do not know how to ask.
Agree (nod head) before understanding tasks.
Do not ask question when do not understand.
None.
Probably--but nothing I can specify.
No, she makes her problems known. At first she was very quiet and shy and agreed with everything.
When they do not understand, they just smile and nod head.
When overpassed for a raise.
Not aware of anything--quiet most of the time.
Yes--he would delay--and bring in a note when he needs time off.
None.
No--they ask if do not understand.
Do not understand above--indicate understanding.
Try to encourage openness--nothing noticed.
Dissatisfaction with shifts and hours.
Let's stress build-up until it more or less explodes--use of interpreter.
Would say "yes" to everything, even if they did not understand.
If they do not understand.
No way of knowing--would not speak up even if they were being treated unfairly.
None--if problems, made effort to get it answered.
No--if problems, they make them known.

They indicate they understand before they really do.
They do not ask questions when they do not understand something.
Probably, but nothing I can identify.
At first but not now--just out of shyness.
Cannot tell--did not speak up much about anything.
None.
Quiet, most of the time--not aware of anything.
They just smile and nod head when they do not understand.
Afraid to speak up out of embarrassment when they have a problem.

Question 11. Employers sometimes mention that the Indochinese do not seem to understand what working in the United States means. In other words, employers in the U.S. have different expectations than those in their native country. Likewise rules, and the organization of work may be different. Have you found anything in particular that the Indochinese do not seem to understand about work in this country?

Personnel Managers

Benefits.
Not to my knowledge.
None.
No.
Laotians are more dependable. Vietnamese less dependable.
None, except insurance benefits.
Not that I am aware of.
Seem compatible--do not seem to understand importance of job longevity.
This type of factory work is totally new to them.
Insurance--I take it for granted that they know.
None.
None noticed.
None.
None--valid work permit.
Nothing.
None.
Technical applications and terms converting into English.
None.
Not really.
No--not in entry level.
No.
None.
Cannot say.
No.
No.
No.
Benefits.
None.
No.
None noticed.
Some problems understanding time clocks at first.
None.

Supervisors

Not after they are oriented--benefits.
No.
Not used to technology--power machines.
No--use of interpreter.
No.
None except see #9. [#9 Days off (holdiays)--sometimes they don't show up.]
See #9 [#9 Company policy, days off--some do not understand overtime hours are occasionally necessary.]
None.
No--very adaptable to most situations.
No.
None.
None.
None.
No.
No.
No.
No.
No.
Would not accept supervisory position.
After general period of adjustment--none.
None.
No.
None.
No.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

No.
None, except time cards.
None.
None--industrious family.
Unenthusiastic--no desire to succeed or get ahead.
I do not know of anything--could not understand health insurance.
Fringe benefits--productivity standard.
Some problems understanding time clocks.
No.
Not that I am aware of.
Nothing.
No.
None.
None.
No.
No.
None.
No.
No.
None, except lunch and coffee breaks, days off.
Team / family concept of company / loyalty.

No--in general seem to be better workers than Americans.
No.
No.
None.
None.
Corporate structure--do not perceive the management structure--delegation of responsibility.
No.
No.
Nothing.
None.
None.
None.
No.
None.
Laotians are more dependable. Vietnamese seem less dependable.

Question 12: Do you have any policies or requirements that especially affect the Indochinese? For example, citizenship or English language requirements.

Personnel Managers

Almost to the point of requiring English fluency because of complicated benefits.
No.
None.
No.
Must speak English--communicate.
No.
None.
None.
Must be neat, clean, dependable.
Must be able to go through an initial interview.
No.
No.
Will hire if no English but require enrollment in English class.
Must be able to get self through interview.
None.
No.
No.
None--but limits mobility.
Not yet.
None.
None. I take anybody that will work. Need interpreter.
Only in terms of advancement.
Some language proficiency. Enough to read instructions.
Must go through interview and application by self.
Go through interview by themselves.
None.
Must speak some English.
Minimum English proficiency--must go through an interview.

Some English proficiency.
No.
No.
Will hire if no English, but must be in process of learning it.
No.
No.

Supervisors

Dress standards--maybe cannot afford appropriate clothes.
No.
No.
No.
No.
No.
No.
No.
No.
No.
None.
None.
None.
No.
Speak some English.
No.
None.
No.
Some language.
None.
No.
No.
None.
No.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

No.
None.
None.
None.
No.
None.
No.
No.
Must have basic language skills.
No immediate families can work here.
No.
No.
Thinking about imposing minimum language proficiency requirement.
None.
Minimum language proficiency--interview self.
None--only three jobs that can be done without some language.

None.
No.
Minimum language proficiency--answer biographical data--because of training problems.
None.
None.
None.
No.
Anyone committed and clean.
None--basic Engiish skills.
Minimum language proficiency.
As long as one understands English.
No.
Must have basic language skills.
No.
No.
Must have basic English skills.
None.
Minimum language proficiency.
Minimum language--from now on.
No.

Question 13: Most jobs, even low level ones, require some communication skills. What I would like you to do is to think of the employees that you supervise.

How is speaking involved in those jobs?

ex. reporting work progress and problems encountered, relaying information, asking questions.

How is listening involved?

ex. taking orders, following instructions.

How is reading involved?

ex. assembly manuals, parts manuals, diagrams, schematics, numbers.

How is writing involved?

ex. making reports, filling out forms, checking things off on a list..

What do the people you are thinking of basically do in their jobs?

ex. operate machines, assemble parts, test equipment.

Personnel Managers

Listening--follow instructions for shift
Speaking--none.
Reading--time cards, work schedule changes, holidays off--bulletins.
Writing--time cards.
Machine production--hand assembly.

Listening--take orders.
Speaking--indicating understanding.
Reading--blueprints, bulletin boards, company policy--use of interpreter.
Writing--time cards, numbers, dates, name.

Listening--when we have to show them what to do.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--drawings, addresses, directions, pick up tickets.
Writing--name.
Welding--truck driver.

Listening--show tasks.
Speaking--ask questions, with customers.
Reading--none, some blueprints.
Writing--none--for general communication.
Assembly, electronic assembly.

Listening--take instructions.
Speaking--only to bring up problems.
Reading--numbers, dimensions.
Writing--numbers, dimensions.
Use of wood saws, assembly of cabinets, sanding.

Listening--take verbal instructions.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--assembly instructions--specifications.
Writing--name, dates.
Assembly of miniature electronics, soldering.

Listening--teachable instructions.
Speaking--
Reading--read specs, assembly.
Writing--
Assembly.

Listening--daily instructions from Supervisor.
Speaking--questions, problems.
Reading--daily report time, progress reports.
Writing--daily report time, progress reports.
Plastic inspecting, molding and plastic assembly.

Listening--initial instructions--mostly through examples.
Speaking--none.
Reading--numbers.
Writing--none.

Supervisors

Listening--follow instructions.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--read company rules, regulations.
Writing--fill out labor tickets, I.D. labels.
Run machines, assembly, packaging.

Listening--thing they have to do for the day.
Speaking--asking questions, acknowledging understanding.
Reading--measurements.
Writing--no.
Sewing machines--alter clothing.

Listening--follow instructions, increase production.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--piece tickets to indicate styles--pay tickets.
Writing--fill out work sheets.
Manufacture clothing--use sewing machines.

Listening--taking orders, following instructions.
Speaking--to Supervisor or other employees.
Reading--numbers, work assignments. Job tickets.
Writing--numbers.
Cut aluminum--punch parts--glaze doors--box for shipping.

Listening--take instructions. Can be shown.
Speaking--not necesary.
Reading--no.
Writing--no.
Operate sewing machines.

Listening--training is verbal, take orders.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--electrical schematics, printed isntructions.
Writing--time cards only--numbers.
Electronic assembly--P.C. boards.

Listening--taking orders, instructions--listening to machines.
Speaking--indicating problems.
Reading--tape measure--job orders.
Writing--numbers, dates, name.

Listening--they must listen to requests and complaints of guests, and take instructions.
Speaking--ask questions--respond to guests.
Reading--guests will leave written requests and complaints in room, do not disturb signs, job sheets.
Writing--numbers, name.

Listening--listen to group leader for product quality, mistakes, instructions.
Speaking--problems encountered, questions. Use interpreter.
Reading--numbers only.
Writing--none.
Final assembly of medical products--conveyor belt. Supply lines with materials, boxing, inspecting.

Listening--take orders.
Speaking--only for clarification--ask questions.
Reading--blueprints--company policy.
Writing--timecards, numbers, dates, name.
Manufacture sheet metal--metal work, welding, operation of machines.

Listening--to assigned tasks.
Speaking--no, but it limits job mobility.
Reading--work orders, blueprints.
Writing--none.
Run machines--drills, lathes, assembly.

Listening--instructions, correction on work.
Speaking--only to ask questions.
Reading--would help if could read blueprints.
Writing--timecards, name.
Patching and finishing structural and architectural concrete forms.

Listening--only to take instructions.
Speaking--only to ask questions.
Reading--machine manuals, bulletin boards.
Writing--record keeping, numbers of parts, quantities.
Manufacture windshields--cutting, bending, laminating, inspecting, packing.

Listening--take instructions.
Speaking--none.
Reading--work orders, numbers.
Writing--work orders, numbers.
Laundrying

Listening--new job tasks--each job is different, instructions.
Speaking--ask questions, bring up problems.
Reading--drawings, blueprints.
Writing--daily work sheets, times, numbers.
Soldering production, wiring, cables.

Listening--take instructions--they often listen but do not understand.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--none.
Writing-none.
Janitorial, sweeping, cleaning.

Listening--take instructions.
Speaking--problems, ask questions.
Reading--very little, tags.
Writing--timecards, work report
Brick production, sorting and stocking.

Listening--take instructions.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--blueprints, terms.
Writing--work orders, requisitions, part names.
Electronic and optical assembly.

Listening--take directions--must show.
Speaking--problems.
Reading--safety signs--control buttons--company notices.
Writing--timecards.
General helper--sweeping, janitorial.

Listening--instructions.
Speaking--problems, questions.
Reading--follow set, manuals, assembly instructions.
Writing--production cards, numbers.
Plastic assembly and manufacturing

Listening--follow instructions.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--company rules--some labels.
Writing--none.
Run machines, assembly, packaging.

Listening--to assigned tasks.
Speaking--none, but it limits job mobility.
Reading--work orders, blueprints.
Writing--none.
Run machines, assembly, welding

Listening--understand instructions.
Speaking--acknowledge that they understand, ask questions.
Reading--numbers.
Writing--numbers.
Operate machinery--drills, saws.

Listening--instructions.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--blueprints and numbers.
Writing--timecards, name.
Wood tools, saw, lathe, wood construction.

Listening--take instructions.
Speaking--none.
Writing--work orders, numbers.
Reading--work orders, numbers.
Laundry and housekeeping.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

Listening--understand tasks
Speaking--acknowledge understanding--ask questions.
Reading--none.
Writing--none.
Operate machinery--drills, saws

Listening--very noisy anyway, so they use sign language a lot.
Speaking--ask questions
Writing--write measurements
Reading--none.
Assembly of engines, drill presses, forklift.

Listening--no.
Speaking--no.
Reading--no.
Writing--no.
Operate laundry equipment.

Listening--most of the time not. Does same thing all the time because of language barrier.
Speaking-no.
Reading--virtually none.
Writing--none--same labels.
Carries trays of plants to table.

Listening--taking orders, follow instructions.
Speaking--no.
Reading--
Writing--
Shear and clean metal, operate equipment.

Listening--take orders, follow instructions.
Speaking--problems encountered, ask questions.
Reading--no, mostly verbal--schematic.
Writing--must diagram his work.
Rebuild electric motors.

Listening--needs to ask questions when they do not understand.
Reading--numbers.
Writing--none.
Run sewing machines, upholstery work, filling backs of furniture with stuffing, wood work.

Listening--initial instructions--most done through example.
Speaking--
Reading--piecework ticket--style number, operation, amount.
Writing--piecework ticket--name, date, employee number.

Listening--taking orders.
Speaking--none.
Reading--boxes of food--read instructions, directions, measures, recipes, schedules (work).
Writing--none.
Prepare food--wash dishes.

Listening--mainly showing--break bells, fire drills.
Speaking--just ask questions.
Reading--no--company notices.
Writing--numbers.
Hand assembly, use saw, hammer, woodwork, washing things.

Listening--taking instructions for day.
Speaking--only to ask questions.
Reading--menu for the day--recipes.
Writing--none.
Prepare food, wash dishes, clean kitchen.

Listening--for instructions and suggestions on her work.
Speaking--asking questions.
Reading--measurements--time card, job ticket.
Writing--numbers, name.
Sewing--manufacture of apparel.

Listening--taking instructions.
Speaking--asking questions.
Reading--style numbers-some abbreviations.
Writing--numbers, dates, names.
Operate sewing machines.

Listening--to customers' reactions and requests.
Speaking--ask names, check blood types.
Reading--manual, FDA regulations, blood tags.
Writing--upkeep a chart.
Fill out charts--withdraw blood.

Listening--taking orders, instructions.
Speaking--none.
Reading--work orders, numbers.
Writing--none.
Prepare and package food.

Listening--follow instructions.
Speaking--no--clarify things--ask questions.
Reading--numbers.
Writing--name.

Listening--take instructions.
Speaking--indicate understanding, ask questions.
Reading--work orders, production procedures, numbers.
Writing--mainly numbers, dates.
Use sewing machines.

Listening--
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--none.
Writing--none.
Assembly, operate machinery.

Listening--take instructions.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--figures, mathematics, numbers.
Writing--figures, mathematics, numbers.
Woodworking equipment (saws, sanders, hammer).

Listening--taking instructions, new job tasks.
Speaking--asking questions, clarification.
Reading--very little, measurements.
Writing--none.
Some machinery--manufacture boats.

Listening--change in job tasks, take instructions.
Speaking--conveying understanding, quality control, problems.
Reading--no.
Writing--packing lists, addresses, numbers.
Assembly of hand tools and packaging.

Listening--to instructions--can with demonstration.
Speaking--indicate clarity, ask questions.
Reading--blueprints, numbers.
Writing--mostly numbers.
Assembly electronic chassis, sheet metal and cabinet building.

Speaking--to guests--acknowledge isntructions.
Listening--instructions--to guests.
Reading--job sheets.
Writing--none.
Clean motel rooms, change linens.

Listening--take instructions day to day.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--cleaning instructions.
Writing--basics.
Dry clean draperies.

Listening--take instructions/use of visuals.
Speaking--ask questions, problems.
Reading--measurements, numbers.
Writing--none.
Furniture assembly.

Listening--understand what they are told.
Speaking--response to questions.
Reading--tape measure. Types of moldings.
Writing--none.
Run wood through machines, inspect.

Listening--instructions of machine use.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--none.
Writing--none.
Use of press and printing machines.

Listening--to take instructions.
Speaking--to ask questions.
Reading--figures, mathematics, measurement.
Writing--figures, mathematics, measurement.
Woodworking equipment (saws, hammer, etc.).

Listening--taking orders.
Speaking--none.
Reading--boxes of food--read recipes, menus, work schedules.
Writing--none.
Prepare food, wash dishes.

Listening--taking instructions.
Speaking--only to ask questions.
Reading--menu of the day, recipes.
Writing--none.
Prepare food, wash dishes, clean kitchen.

Listening--take instructions.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--none.
Writing--time, card, name.
Wash dishes, clean.

Listening--take instructions.
Speaking--ask questions/clarification.
Reading--numbers.
Writing--none.
Furniture assembly.

Listening--had to do the same thing always because of language barrier.
Speaking--none.
Reading--virtually none.
Writing--none--some labels.
Carries tray of plants around.

Listening--take orders, instructions.
Speaking--none.
Reading--none.
Writing--none.
Clean cars, prepare for sale.

Listening--taking instructions.
Speaking--ask questions.
Reading--style numbers.
Writing--name, dates, numbers.
Operate sewing machines.

Listening--to take instructions.
Speaking--none.
Reading--numbers, labels.
Writing--numbers, labels.
Operate sewing machines.

Question 14: Throughout all of these questions, I've lumped all the Indochinese groups (Vietnamese, Laosian, Cambodian, etc.) together. Have you noticed any differences between these groups with regard to the questions I've been asking?

Personnel Managers

Vietnamese more energetic, more used to industrial environment.
Hmong, Laotians, adjustment takes longer initially.
None noticed.
No differences.
No.
Both Vietnamese.
Vietnamese less stable.
Have noticed no difference.
No.
Those with physical work experience are better.
Hmong are more backwards but hardworking.
No.
Cambodians seem to be faster learners. Hard workers, more aggressive / assertive.
Laotians better workers than Cambodians. No experience with Vietnamese. Could be understood.
Cambodians are less dependable, often did not show up.
Generally, Laotians are most agreeable and dependable. Laotians are taller.
No.
Cannot tell any difference.
No.
Only had Cambodians.
Hmong, quieter, hardworking, more aloof. Laotians, more lax.
Vietnamese even more concerned about work.
No.
No.
Cannot tell difference. Cambodians, not as friendly, shorter.
They do not mix--do not like each other.
Do not work well together--different groups.
Cambodians have not been productive employees. Laotians have been really good and so have Vietnamese.
Vietnamese more energetic, more industrialized.
Cambodians seem to learn quicker, are more aggressive.
Vietnamese are better workers, better attendance--more effort.
Laotians are better workers than Cambodians--no experience with Vietnamese.
Physical appearance--Laotians more conscientious.
Cannot tell any difference.

Supervisors

Laotian--hardest adjustment because of communication.
No difference.
Only Korean.
Only language differences.
No difference.
None.
No.
No.
Easier to communicate with Vietnamese. Maybe we have had more of them.
Cambodians work harder, learn faster. Laotians seem more lazy and learn slower.
Not really.
None.
Laotians are smaller.
Seem basically same to me.
None.
No.
Vietnamese very aloof--do not associate with Laotians.
No.
Cannot tell difference. Cambodians not as friendly--shorter.
Laotians--longer adjustment.
Cambodians seem to work hardest. Laotians seem more lazy.
No.
No.

Personnel Managers and Sueprvisors (Both)

Vietnamese are better workers, better attendance, more effort.
Not applicable.
No.
None--only had Vietnamese.
No.
Only Vietnamese.
None.
Physical appearance--Laotians more conscientious.
No.
No.
Not applicable.
Had better success with Laotians / worse with Vietnamese (high turnover).
No.
Not applicable.
None.
Do not like each other--do not mix.
Vietnamese seem more educated, more responsible.
Laotians not nearly as good of workers, slower to learn--more difficulty with language. Do not know about Cambodians.
None.
None.
No.
No.

Have not noticed.
None.
No representation.
Only had one.
No.
No. Only have one.
No.
Have not noticed.
Only had Vietnamese.
No.
Laotians best--more dependable.
See #11 [#11 Laotians are more dependable, Vietnamese seem less dependable.

Question 15: Is there anything about the Indochinese as workers that you would like to add?

Personnel Managers

None.
They try hard--are good workers. Do not try to take advantage of situation.
No.
Pleased with performance. Would hire more.
Very conscientious.
No.
Resettlement process should provide more English language programs.
No.
Pleased, except for turnover--they seem to be easily discouraged.
No.
Integrity--better attitude than locals, just because happy to have a job.
No.
Would prefer to hire Indochinese because of dependability rather than job service person.
No.
Do not make much effort to become acculturated--do not practice English.
Will not hire only one with no one to communicate with. Example, a lot of Vietnamese and one Laotian.
No.
No.
No.
None.
Very good finger dexterity.
No.
Would prefer to hire more Indochinese.

Supervisor

They object to heavy lifting.
No.
Dependable, punctual, responsible, polite.
Very conscientious.

No.
None.
No.
No.
No.
No.
None.
Those that have been here longer are better off--the new ones are not as well educated.
Fast and accurate once they know what doing.
None.
No.
No.
Very good finger dexterity.
No.
No.

Personnel Managers and Supervisors (Both)

No.
Work really well--better than Americans.
Marvelous workers.
Good workers.
No. Should teach English before getting jobs--should not have to use interpreter.
None.
Either good or not good, no mediocre.
No.
Seem to work harder than others--try really hard.
No.
No.
No.
No.
No.
No.
None.
No.
Nothing.
No.
No.
None.
No.
Nothing.
No.
Good workers, in general.

APPENDIX E

EXCERPT FROM PROGRAM DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS FOR ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

D. ESL/GENERAL VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTION FOCUS

DEFINITION:

ESL/GENERAL VOCATIONAL provides the client with language and skills necesary for getting and keeping a job, an orientation to the American job market, expectations about work in the U.S., and the ability to deal with the aopplication and interview process without extensive assistance, and with work-related interpersonal interactions.

CLIENTS TO BE SERVED:

ESL/GENERAL VOCATIONAL is for clients who wish and have the ability to get, keep or advance in a job.

DELIVERY:

Any of the delivery settings outlined (non-formal, single multi-level class, center, on-job site) may be used, but the system chosen should be suited to the number of clients to be served and their geographical distribution.

INTENSITY:

The intensity will vary according to the local situation and needs of the clients to be served.

CONTENT:

ESL/GENERAL VOCATIONAL may include but not be limited to:

. Language skills with an emphasis on

pronunciation
aural (listening) understanding
American idioms
informal language use

. Also an emphasis on other skills and information such as:

job finding/seeking
interviewing
filling out applications and forms
career exploration
employer expectations
employee rights and responsibilities
salaries and fringe benefits
assessing marketable skills
interpersonal relationships in a work setting
giving and taking instructions
cultural work norms
test taking skills

OUTCOME:

Clients who complete ESL/GENERAL VOCATIONAL should be able to demonstrate the skills necessary to acquire and maintain employment and potentially advance on the job, such as the ability to:

complete forms
give and take instruction
interpret a paycheck stub

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

- ESL/GENERAL VOCATIONAL is particularly applicable to evening programs.
- A successful outcome may include placement in a vocational training program.
- ESL/GENERAL VOCATIONAL is appropriate for clients who want to work but who do not want to go into skills training.
- The materials used should reflect the emphasis placed on idioms and the language and customs of the workplace.
- The use of native language aides may be very helpful in explaining American customs and practices in terms the clients can understand, especially clients with low level language skills.